DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 663 SP 028 178

TITLE	Visions of Reform: Implications for the Education Profession. The Report of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force.
INSTITUTION	Association of Teacher Educators, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	74p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Teacher Educators, Suite ATE, 1900 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Accreditation (Institutions); Economic Factors; *Educational Change; *Educational Policy; *Position Papers; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This report presents an analysis and implications of three current and major education reform reports. Part one reviews and analyzes the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) redesign, the Holmes Group report, and the report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. Part two points out the implications which the reform efforts hold for state education agencies, public schools, and institutions of higher education in the areas of policy development, leadership/assistance, monitoring/evaluation, and marketing. Also included are "Commentary" and "Look to the Future" sections to provide a basis for thinking about the potential impact of these reports. The report generally supports the redesign of NCATE, but raises serious questions about the Holmes Group exclusionary model for preparing teachers. The report also cautions about the Carnegie Forum proposals for a national board to certify teachers, and for directly relating teacher incentives to standardized student product measures. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FD274663

VISIONS OF REFORM:

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE EDUCATION PROFESSION

The Report of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Stevenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 178

Members of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force

Dr. John Sikula, Chair
Dean of the Graduate School of Education
California State University, Long Beach
Long Beach, California

Dr. James Collins
Director of the National Council
of States for Inservice Education
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Dr. Donald Cruickshank
Professor of Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Dr. Keith Eicher
Coordinator of Field Experiences
University of Richmond
Richmond, Virginia

Dr. Nicholas Hobar
Assistant State Superintendent for Instruction
Maryland State Department of Education
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. Mary Marockie
Research and Curriculum Coordinator
Regional Education Service Agency
Wheeling, West Virginia

Dr. Jerry Robbins
Dean of the College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Robert Schuck, Ex-Officio Member
ATE President
Distinguished Visiting Professor
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi

Visions of Reform:

Implications for the Education Profession

The Report of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force

John Sikula, Chair

Fall, 1986

About ATE

The Association of Teacher Educators was founded in 1920. ATE is the only national, individual membership organization devoted solely to the improvement of teacher education for both school-based and campus-based teacher educators. ATE members represent over 650 colleges and universities, 500 major school systems and the majority of the state departments of education. ATE's offices are located in the Washington, D.C. area where it presents its members' interests before governmental agencies and educational organizations. ATE members come from all 50 states and around the world.

Copyright © 1986 by the Association of Teacher Educators
1900 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

All rights reserved. Published in October, 1986.

Printed in the United States of America.

The points of view and opinions expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Association of Teacher Educators.

CONTENTS

Page

Preface v

Introduction 1

Part I Review and Analysis of Three Reform Proposals

NCATE Redesign 5
- Review 5
- Analysis 7

Holmes Group 8
- Review 8
- Analysis 9

Carnegie Forum 13
- Review 13
- Analysis 14

Report Relationships 20

Part II Implications for the Education Profession

State Education Agencies 25

Institutions of Higher Education 30
- Bachelor's-Level Institutions 30
- State Colleges and Universities 33
- Research-Oriented Universities 44

Local Education Agencies 47

Commentary 53

A Look to the Future 59
- Another Vision 59

Conclusion 65

References 67

LFTE

One of the stated goals of ATE's Leadership Fund for Teacher Education is to:

> "assist in the dissemination of findings relating to new and promising developments in the field of teacher education."

The Report of ATE's Blue Ribbon Task Force is a document that should be carefully studied by every professional involved in the preparation of teachers and "LFTE" is pleased to assist in the publication of this report.

The Leadership Fund for Teacher Education is financed by contributions from educators and companies or individuals concerned with education. Should you wish to be a part of this effort, you may make a tax deductible contribution by sending your check to:

Association of Teacher Educators
Leadership Fund for Teacher Education
1900 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

Preface

When the ATE Board of Directors met in Chicago in April, 1986 it discussed how the organization might respond to the growing body of proposals for reforming teacher education. It was decided to establish a Blue Ribbon Task Force to consider three such reforms. The Task Force was appointed in May and arranged its first meeting in Columbus, Ohio for June. Appointed were eight members who came from different states and provided the viewpoints of local education agencies, state education agencies, and different types of institutions of higher education. Materials including reform reports, analyses and reactions of many types were provided to Task Force members prior to the first meeting.

The Task Force met a second time in August in Flagstaff, Arizona in conjunction with the ATE Summer Workshop. A September deadline for a final draft of the complete Report was established. The Report was to be released as early in the Fall as possible so that a timely and useful ATE response to new teacher education reform proposals would be generally available.

To assist the Task Force in getting started, former ATE Presidents Robert Houston and Robert Roth attended the first meeting to help organize the effort and define the group's work. The group divided writing tasks and decided that much of the report would present implications of three reform reports for different client groups—state education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), and three types of institutions of higher education (IHEs)—bachelor's-level institutions, state colleges and universities and research-oriented universities.

In Flagstaff the Task Force discussed draft material and developed the concluding two sections of the Report. Pulling together and synthesizing the implications of the three different reports for five client groups proved to be no simple task. Considerable time and effort were spent developing the concluding "Commentary" and "A Look to the Future" sections.

During mid-August, Chair John Sikula edited a draft final Report and circulated it to Task Force members and selected others. Comments were gathered and revisions incorporated in early September.

Task Force members expect that the Report will help those involved in school improvement and teacher preparation to derive some benefit from the numerous reports, directives and suggestions about how to improve. Changing the present and charting the future are not simple matters, particularly when tough choices have to be made with limited resources. In our country, which prides itself on strength through diversity, all groups, agencies and institutions will not choose to proceed in the same direction. This Task Force Report is not intended to direct action as much as it is to encourage the analysis of options and to stimulate thinking through the consequences of pursuing various alternatives.

In completing the Report, the Task Force wishes to acknowledge the work of the Office of the Dean, Graduate School of Education, California State University, Long Beach. More specifically, gratitude is expressed to Belen Estrada, Dean's Secretary, and Karen Van Lowe, Graduate Assistant for preparing the manuscript for publication.

Also, the Task Force wishes to thank Martin Haberman, Chair of the national Communications Committee of ATE, who worked with a subcommittee to review the draft final Report and to provide editorial refinements.

John Sikula, Chair
ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force

Introduction

This Report presents an analysis and implications of three current and major education reform reports likely to have some significant impact in years ahead. A new and independent analysis of these three reports was made in order to stimulate thinking about the consequences of the different recommendations. The three reports selected for scrutiny—NCATE Redesign, the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum—were ones considered by the ATE Board of Directors as being the most critical and in need of serious examination in the professional education literature. With this in mind, the reader should begin the review of this Report by first understanding the context within which it was developed.

SETTING THE CONTEXT

America's most important resource is its people, especially its children. Because of the need to nurture this resource, a significant amount of human, temporal and financial resources are expended by America's schools to help children and youth become productive citizens. Among educators and the public there is common agreement that teachers are a significant if not major influence in fostering student development.

The public's persistent call for improvement in the quality of education provided to children and youth has resurfaced in a new wave of national reports which address teaching and teacher education. Based on the assumption that the quality of education is directly related to the quality of the teacher, these reports propose dramatic changes in the current working environment of teachers and in the standards and practices used in recruiting, preparing, certificating and rewarding teachers to serve in tomorrow's classrooms. These classrooms, however, are beginning to and will continue to look much different than today's classrooms, primarily because of changes in society. Moreover, changes in demographic trends, increases in at-risk student classroom populations, recent findings concerning teacher effectiveness, landmark litigation concerning equity and equal educational opportunity, the use of technology to bolster instruction, and local and statewide school improvement efforts have begun to forge educational environments unlike those ever before seen in America's public schools.

As educators strive to promote higher levels of achievement, the quality of education delivered to students will be directly related to the nature of the contemporary learner served, the efficacy of the educational delivery system used to provide instruction, and, as in the past, to the quality of the classroom teacher. Future students, teachers and classrooms will reflect new and different sets of needs and characteristics. Consequently, changes proposed to improve teaching and teacher education must be made with these factors in mind and must be aligned with and be supportive of the needs of contemporary students and the programmatic direction of the public schools.

The classroom delivery system currently used in the schools has a distinct set of characteristics. These characteristics were designed, developed and implemented as a classroom delivery system during the industrial age of American society and for generations of learners quite different from contemporary students. Our

emerging decentralized and information-based society is characterized by a body of knowledge that is doubling approximately every 40 months. A new classroom delivery system for meeting learning and curricular needs will be necessary to facilitate student development in the future.

THE QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF TEACHERS

The public should be reassured that professionally prepared, certified and well-qualified teachers are employed and assigned to offer high quality educational programs. However, most recent reports on the quality and supply of teachers point to inadequacies in performance and an increasing need for teachers in most states and subject areas. The problem, then, is to meet the needs of contemporary students by implementing high-quality public school programs utilizing new classroom delivery systems and changing teaching and teacher education in ways which support these improvements.

NCATE Redesign, the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum reports provide three proposals for accomplishing reform. In the sections to follow, each report is reviewed and analyzed, and implications for the major education constituencies are identified. Finally, "Commentary" and "A Look to the Future" sections are offered to provide readers a basis for thinking about the potential impact of these reports.

Along with this introduction and context setting, the reader should keep in mind that we may view the context within which these three reform proposals were developed somewhat differently and more positively than the authors of the reports analyzed. Some of our assumptions are developed in "A Look to the Future." They explain differences of opinion regarding the current context and environment within which all proposals for change must operate.

Part I

Review and Analysis of Three Reform Proposals

NCATE REDESIGN

REVIEW

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) seeks to ensure excellence and competence in the education profession and toward that end has established standards of quality and vigor for teacher preparation programs. The NCATE review process provides for voluntary self-regulation of a professional education unit within an institution of higher education responsible for the preparation of students who seek state teacher certification. Both the U.S. Department of Education and the Council on Post-secondary Accreditation (COPA) recognize NCATE as the authorized accreditation agency in the field of school personnel preparation. The responsibility for systematic evaluation and revision of accreditation standards is vested in the Council and its Committee on Standards.

To be eligible for accreditation an institution must (a) offer programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel, and (b) meet eleven (11) preconditions which address: administrative processes and procedures; policies related to the unit; policies related to admission and exit criteria (evaluation); evidence of institutional accreditation by both state and regional boards; and which provide indications of compliance with federal laws. Satisfying the 11 preconditions moves an institution toward the on-site review process and enhances the potential for successful accreditation. Failure to meet the preconditions results in the denial of eligibility for review until specified deficiencies are removed. An institution may choose to resubmit its application with sufficient documentation to show that the deficiencies have been corrected, or it may choose to discontinue the pursuit of accreditation.

An evaluation team selected from the NCATE Board of Examiners, composed of representatives from the National Education Association, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and other constituencies, visits an accreditation-seeking institution to determine if the standards for approval are met. All team members undergo extensive training in the standards and the criteria for which the following accreditation decisions can be made:

1. Full accreditation - unequivocal and without accompanying conditions
2. Accreditation - with stipulations for specific shortcomings and a timetable for meeting the stipulations
3. Denial - rejection of initial accreditation
4. Revocation - termination of current accreditation

Accreditation is granted to the unit rather than to specific programs. Differentiation is made only between undergraduate basic programs and advanced-level graduate programs. The unit may retain its accreditation as long as it continues to meet the standards and chooses to participate. Termination of accreditation may result if the unit no longer meets the standards or preconditions, refuses to pay its assessed fees, refuses to submit annual reports, misrepresents its status, or fails to meet stipulated timelines.

The redesigned Standards reflect a more comprehensive and vigorous process to ensure excellence and competence in the profession.

STANDARD ONE: THE KNOWLEDGE BASE

This standard addresses three basic components of the knowledge base: (1) the design of the curriculum; (2) the delivery of the curriculum; and (3) the content of the curriculum. The first component addresses the need for the program to be based on established research and knowledge of sound professional practices. Explicit in this standard is the expectation that the program will provide study and experiences related to culturally diverse and exceptional populations. Component two requires the faculty of an institution to model the best instructional program and methods. General education, specialty studies and professional studies are addressed in the third component. Studies in these areas must be linked through a collaborative institutional effort that provides for the development of cognitive, process and behavioral knowledge.

STANDARD TWO: RELATIONSHIP TO THE WORLD OF PRACTICE

The areas of clinical and field-based experiences, relationships with graduates, and relationships with schools are addressed in this standard. It is required that the clinical and field-based experiences be interwoven throughout the professional education curriculum in order to relate classroom knowledge to the variety of settings for which the education students are being prepared. Further, it is expected that the unit will maintain and develop relationships with its graduates and will provide assistance to first-year teachers when needed. A stronger linkage with the schools served by the unit is also required. This component recognizes the collaborative nature of the teacher preparation process and serves to improve the delivery of quality education in the schools.

STANDARD THREE: STUDENTS

This standard addresses criteria for admission to the program, for advising services, and for procedures monitoring progress and assessing student competence at the completion of the program. The admission process must encourage recruitment of a culturally-diverse population, proficient in communication and other basic skills and having an extensive liberal arts background. It is expected that student progress will be reviewed periodically by both students and faculty advisers for guidance purposes. The advising system must provide both academic and professional assistance leading to completion of the program and initial certification. The unit is also responsible for determining the academic and professional competence of students via a multitude of evaluation methods.

STANDARD FOUR: THE FACULTY

Faculty qualifications, assignments, loads, evaluation and opportunities for development are examined in this standard. It is required that faculty be committed to continuing improvement of the teaching profession and to professional inquiry, and that faculty assignments are based on the appropriateness of qualifications, experience and advanced preparation. The faculty should also reflect cultural diver-

sity. A sufficient number of faculty to offer the programs and written policies limiting faculty teaching and supervision loads are required. A program for faculty development that reflects a systematic, comprehensive plan is also required. The evaluation of faculty requires that data attesting to continued effective competence in teaching, scholarship and service be collected and used as the bases for salary, promotion and tenure decisions.

STANDARD FIVE: GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

This standard addresses the need for a governance system that ensures that the unit has programs that are organized, unified and coordinated. Sufficient resources to enable the unit to fulfill its mission are also required.

ANALYSIS

Of the three reform efforts under consideration, the one which has been the most extensive in terms of the use of collaborative consultative processes involving affected groups is the NCATE Redesign. Partly because of this, the specifics incorporated in this reform are probably less controversial and more widely endorsed than some of the recommendations from the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum. NCATE Redesign focuses on institutions offering teacher education, not on schools or teaching as a profession. Support for the Redesign has been carefully developed through democratic processes such as: presentations and dialogue at different types of national, state and district professional meetings; state and campus visits; analyses in the professional education literature; and open invitations to contribute to the effort.

The NCATE Redesign effort has been several years in the making. It puts into place a more rigorous and respected set of standards nationally recognized by COPA as being appropriate to the accreditation of teacher preparation programs. While different standards are proposed, there is no attempt to shift control and responsibility for licensing, or program review and approval, away from states to some other agency, organization or level of government.

Within NCATE Redesign is a deliberate attempt to encourage diversity, imagination and innovation in institutional planning. This aspect is supported by those seeking less bureaucracy and more allowance for professional judgment in the teacher preparation process. The new Standards are broad and allow for experimentation and different formats as well as for the exercise of professional judgment and expertise in compliance efforts.

The new NCATE preconditions and Standards encourage stronger involvement of school-based practitioners and cooperative research with local schools. Required as preconditions will be factors considered by most teacher educators as worthy of support. For example, required will be state program approval, regional accreditation, written governing unit policies, candidate skills assessment, and evaluation of graduates and programs. These new Standards and preconditions will present some difficulties, particularly for bachelor's-level IHEs and for research-oriented universities. These difficulties are indicated in Part II of this Report.

With NCATE Redesign, states maintain their federally-constituted responsibility to certify teachers. The new Standards become effective in 1988. They address

initial certification, but leave program length and level (graduate and/or undergraduate) up to each preparation unit. More rigorous programs will result from the efforts which address the entire scope of teacher preparation including governance and resources.

Because of extensive and democratic involvement of affected groups, NCATE support appears to be growing.

HOLMES GROUP

REVIEW

In 1983, 17 education deans interested in alternative ways to involve "major research universities" in improving the quality of teacher education convened. As the group continued to meet its size increased to 23. It developed and submitted a proposal to philanthropic foundations and the U.S. Department of Education. Following funding in 1984, a report with recommendations was drafted, reviewed, revised, made official in 1985, and distributed a year later.

Recently 123 institutions have been invited to participate in Holmes Group charter membership. Invitations were extended to institutions belonging to the American Association of Universities, those with reputations or potential for excellence in research and development in education, and selected others.

According to the report, the U.S. was divided into five geographic regions with regional coordinators serving on a national coordinating committee which included the group's president and the vice-president of the board of directors. Regional coordinators also serve on the board of directors.

Substantively, the report calls for:

- *Extended programs* of teacher education wherein the professional education of teachers would take place in a two-year, post-graduate master's degree program following a four-year baccalaureate;
- *Three tiers of teachers:* beginning with "instructors" who would be baccalaureate graduates without professional preparation permitted to teach under supervision for less than five years if they have a sound general education, a strong major or minor in the teaching field and the basics of pedagogy; "professionals" who would have completed the full six-year program and be recommended for certification; and "career professionals" who would engage in study beyond the master's degree, most likely leading to the doctorate, and be responsible for the supervision of the "instructors;"
- *Improvement of undergraduate instruction* so that potential teachers can study subjects they will teach with exemplary instructors who understand the pedagogy of their subjects;
- *More in-depth study* of subjects taught by prospective elementary teachers—more study of pedagogy by prospective secondary teachers;
- *Evaluation of teacher candidates* for entry, retention and licensing;
- Preparation of more thoughtful, *reflective teachers;*

- Utilization of *expert K-12 teachers* in the education of teachers and in the conduct of research;
- Development of *clinical experiences* in schools as opposed to apprenticeships;
- *Identification of and focus on the knowledge base that supports teaching practice;*
- *Stepped-up research* on teaching, teacher education and the learning of academic subjects;
- Transformation of schools into places regarded for their professional autonomy where *teacher leadership* is apparent;
- Establishing "*professional development schools*" analogous to teaching hospitals; and
- Increasing the number and quality of *minority candidates* in teacher education.

ANALYSIS

An analysis of Tomorrow's Teachers, the Holmes Group report, reveals elements worthy of praise, as well as elements of serious concern. The Group can and should be commended for its five major goals and the zeal with which it has addressed problems in teacher preparation and the profession of teaching. It has focused needed attention to the current crisis in preparing sufficient numbers of high quality, fully-prepared teachers for our nation's schools.

The rationale of the Holmes Group states that "would-be reformers (of teacher education) have attempted to impose solutions, assuming that their ideas could be readily accepted and implemented without the active involvement of practitioners. We can no longer perpetuate such major oversights."

Deans, directors and chairs of schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs) must become more involved in reform efforts if they are to be successful.

The stated goals of the Group are:

1. to make the education of teachers intellectually more solid;
2. to recognize differences in teacher knowledge, skill, and commitment in education, certification, and work;
3. to create standards of entry to the profession - examinations and educational requirements - that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible;
4. to connect institutions to schools; and
5. to make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn.

The Holmes Group's goals are broadly designed to encourage support. The problems arise in operationalizing the goals and developing strategies that are likely to produce the intended results for the majority of people.

There are elements within the Report with which most reform-minded teacher educators would agree. Indeed, essentially supportive statements have already been issued by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and other professional groups associated with teaching. Some of the aspects of the Holmes

Group report which are consistent with general teacher preparation reform efforts already underway include:

1. The Group supports a strong knowledge base in teacher education. Academically strong, subject matter-centered programs are supported, particularly for the first four years.
2. Academically talented people, particularly minorities, are encouraged to be recruited to work in schools.
3. Variety and flexibility are encouraged in terms of the acceptability of backgrounds for entry-level participation in teacher preparation.
4. Marginally qualified teachers in training are expected to engage in additional university coursework and in supervised field experiences or leave teaching (within five years). Emergency licensed teachers are not supported.
5. A stronger teaching credential is proposed along with postponed certification until the completion of expanded supervised teaching and coursework.
6. Induction-year and beginning-teacher support systems are suggested. A year-long, paid and well-supervised internship is proposed.
7. Four-year programs are seen as background for entry-level positions which require further on-the-job experience and university coursework before full certification.
8. Suggestions are made for professional development schools as exemplary teaching sites. Clinical experiences are encouraged as is the active involvement of practitioners in teacher preparation reform efforts.
9. There is support for the idea that improving teacher preparation must be tied to plans to improve public school teaching and schooling in general.
10. The belief that teachers are professionals who deserve better pay and improved working conditions is made clear.
11. Differentiation in teaching certification, pay, work and responsibilities is supported.
12. Multiple assessments of teacher candidates before entering professional programs, during preparation, and before initial certification are supported. Teacher performance assessment beyond paper-and-pencil testing is encouraged.
13. The need for altering university reward structures is clearly supported. New relationships with schools and practitioners require quality time and effort which will not materialize unless university rewards are associated with the endeavors.

Despite these consistencies with other teacher preparation and teaching profession reform initiatives, there are also concerns with the Holmes Group and its report. The Holmes Group reform agenda is based on some tenuous assumptions:

1. The Holmes Group contains those universities which have the capacity to improve teacher education.
2. Teacher education reform efforts should be directed by some universities

currently outside the mainstream of established major teacher production programs and teacher preparation reform initiatives.

3. Teacher preparation programs and public schools in general are doing a poor job and little effort to change is in evidence.

Specific questions about the Holmes Group report are:

1. If Holmes Group recommendations were followed, would the teacher shortage problem in this country be exacerbated, particularly the shortage of minority students entering teaching? Is the elimination of undergraduate majors and/or programs ill-advised in a time of serious national shortage?
2. Does the Group intend to restrict access of inservice opportunities for teachers to research universities, which are often in settings geographically distant from practicing teachers in need of professional development experiences? Teachers need easy access to inservice at low or no cost. Of course, some inservice could be done by "career professional teachers."
3. Is it cost effective to advocate that teacher education should become a high priority item in universities where it is not, and low or no priority in institutions where strong or at least average support already exists?
4. Is early involvement in school settings as active participants, a practice recognized as helpful and important to preparing teachers, destined for elimination? This practice can help students confirm or change career choices and develop a personal knowledge about teaching and learning.
5. Generic methods courses would be replaced with subject-matter-oriented studies of teaching and learning. Are not generic methods courses at many SCDEs (schools, colleges and departments of education) worthwhile since they do provide knowledge of what we know about teaching and learning?
6. Would joining the new Holmes Group further confuse an already fragmented profession? If the Group were to thrive, could it be at the expense of already established organizations such as AACTE, ATE and NCATE? If this were to happen, teacher preparation reform efforts and the move to further professionalize teaching might experience a serious setback. Teaching as a profession could be weakened rather than strengthened.
7. Would expecting the Holmes standards to serve as a basis for accreditation for research universities undermine the legitimate authority of NCATE?
8. Would having the Holmes Group develop and administer its own series of professional teacher examinations be a duplication of effort and at least somewhat inconsistent with the notion of what an accrediting body is supposed to do?
9. Some Holmes Group members are unlikely to invest heavily in teacher education reform. Research universities have a long history of relegating SCDEs to second-class status and of not valuing the activities centered around them. Should uncommitted institutions be made leaders while committed institutions are reduced in status?
10. The Holmes Group prepares less than 10 percent of our nation's teachers,

and it systematically excludes major producers and universities where teacher education is a much higher priority item than at research universities. Will not successful reform of teacher preparation require focusing on the major producers of teachers in this country?

11. Even those who choose to join the group will be reluctant to eliminate undergraduate programs for a variety of reasons. Cannot such programs serve the functions of recruitment, selection and pre-professional preparation rather than be abolished?
12. Does not the Holmes Group exaggerate the importance of research universities in reforming teacher education and ignore and systematically exclude institutions where substantive investments have already been made? Many non-doctoral institutions of higher education have first-rate teacher preparation programs; likewise, many research universities have small and marginal programs by almost any standard.

We view the Holmes Group report as an earnest attempt by major university deans of education to elevate the concern and status associated with teacher education on their campuses. The Group is seeking support on its own campuses and has mapped out a strategy to accomplish this goal. This strategy attempts to heighten the priority of teacher preparation in environments not traditionally supportive of schools, colleges and departments of education.

The Holmes Group report can be used constructively by research universities to bring needed attention to the quality of teacher education in their institutions. The report may promote important structural revisions on some campuses and may enhance teacher education as a central mission. It is to the credit of the Holmes Group that these deans have agreed to fight this battle in the institutional war over resources.

A problem with the report remains, however, for people not associated with research universities. A real concern with the Group's report, from this perspective, is that its recommendations are inconsistent with its goals. If the goal is to transform teaching from an occupation into a genuine profession and to reform teacher education in the process, then many people fear that you "cannot get there from here." The strategy selected for reform is too restrictive.

The strategy appears to propose a single model appropriate for the preparation of all teachers. Such an approach has been resisted by ATE, AACTE, NCATE and most other professional organizations associated with teaching. There is a rich variety of effective IHE models for preparing teachers today. This is a unique feature of American education, and it should not only be maintained, but also enhanced. In order to reflect accurately geographic, institutional and cultural diversity in America, more than one approach is necessary. Combinations of undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs are possible and are needed, as are pre-professional programs for students interested in careers in teaching.

The Holmes Group recommends that it become its own "quality check" (i.e., accreditation agency) for research universities and their schools or colleges of education. Whether this monitoring strategy supplants, or only supplements,

NCATE accreditation is unclear. NCATE is maintaining a continuing contact with the Holmes Group to explore a possible cooperative resolution of this obviously sensitive issue.

It should be pointed out that the NCATE Redesign does not prevent an institution associated with the Holmes Group from being NCATE accredited. Holmes Group members generally would meet NCATE Redesign Standards. The Holmes Group, however, is restrictive; all those meeting Redesign requirements would not meet Holmes expectations, which extend well beyond the NCATE Standards. Many NCATE-approved teacher preparation institutions without doctoral programs would be unacceptable to the Holmes Group.

Some of what is proposed by the Holmes Group would strengthen the preparation of teachers, e.g., professional development schools, increasing minority participation, and articulating the knowledge base of the profession. These can be accomplished regardless of the level of study (graduate or undergraduate). We are concerned, however, about the restrictive nature of elements in the proposal such as eliminating undergraduate education majors and including only research-oriented universities in major teacher education reform efforts.

CARNEGIE FORUM

REVIEW

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy was established in January, 1985 to draw attention to the link between economic growth in this country and the skills and abilities of the people who contribute to that growth, and to help develop educational policies to meet future economic needs. In March, 1985, the Forum agreed to establish the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. The Task Force Report, issued in May, 1986 calls for the overhaul of the teaching profession, and it argues that if the changes suggested are not implemented, rapidly and totally, then our economy will erode and our standard of living will decline.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, the report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, starts with the economy. As with *A Nation at Risk,* there is a pessimistic view of national economic well-being in the future unless the education process is improved.

The Carnegie Forum report concludes that to insure economic well-being in the future we must achieve "far more demanding educational standards than we have ever attempted to reach before." To accomplish this goal we must *create* a teaching profession "equal to the task." The term "create" was undoubtedly carefully selected. Indeed, the Carnegie Forum report calls for "sweeping changes in education policy."

In order to create a teaching profession equal to the task of delivering higher-than-ever educational achievements the Carnegie Forum proposes the following:

1. Create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet these standards.

2. Restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teaching, freeing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress.
3. Restructure the teaching force, and introduce a new category of "Lead Teachers" with proven ability to provide active leadership in the redesign of the schools and in helping colleagues uphold high standards of learning and teaching.
4. Require a bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching.
5. Develop a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master in Teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching, including internships and residencies in the schools.
6. Mobilize the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.
7. Relate incentives for teachers to school-wide student performance, and provide schools with the technology, services and staff essential to teacher productivity.
8. Make teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions.

The Carnegie Task Force places its faith in the establishment of the National Board to include governors, chief state school officers, school administrators, and classroom teachers. The Board would develop standards for national professional certification (not state licensure). The Board would be formed from state and regional structures. The Carnegie Task Force is hopeful that the individual states would require Board certification and state licensure. This would symbolize the strength or "clout" of the profession - all on a strictly voluntary-compliance basis.

ANALYSIS

The Carnegie Forum presents economic arguments for educational reform. A position is developed favoring placing higher value on schooling and learning, values which have slipped in the recent past as high American priorities.

Portrayed is an accurate picture of the need for more fully-qualified and intelligent teachers. Many school districts are in fact replacing half of their teachers in the next three or four years due to retirements and growth. Some studies indicate that as many as half the current teachers will leave their positions by 1992 due to career changes or retirement.

The report stresses both the crisis and window of opportunity currently existing. Some 1.3 million new teachers are needed before 1992. Children of the "baby boom" are now of school age. Students are increasingly coming from low-income, non-English speaking and single-parent households. Schools are increasingly becoming populated with a larger number and percentage of minority students, and a smaller number and percentage of minority teachers. This situation, it is argued, requires immediate, dramatic, creative and bold action.

The report is credible, not only because of the credentials of the distinguished

Task Force members, but also because of its sponsorship. In the last 80 years the Carnegie Foundation and its affiliates have played a major role in educational reform. They introduced the basic concept of high school academic credits, reorganized medical education in this country, were instrumental in forming the Educational Testing Service, and in recent decades played a major role in the expansion of higher education.

The Task Force report is directed to the American people. The recommendations have been supported by many major organizations and influential people, including the president of the American Federation of Teachers who has given full support to the recommendations, and the president of the National Education Association who supports the report with reservations. Both were members of the Task Force.

The Carnegie report has been welcomed by AACTE and applauded by NCATE for promoting dialogue on important educational issues. NCATE, AACTE and the NEA, however, have each expressed some concerns along with their support. Many other prominent people and organizations have commented about the report and have expressed varying degrees of support and reservation. After two days of heated debate, the NEA endorsed the Carnegie recommendation for the creation of a National Board at its July, 1986 National Convention, emphasizing that states should retain full authority and responsibility for licensure. This action is in keeping with efforts to establish NEA member-directed state professional practices boards.

Many recommendations in the report are not new; rather they synthesize ideas previously expressed by a number of educators and organizations; for example, higher teacher salaries, better working conditions, and encouragement for minority teachers are proposed.

The report contains a few radical elements. For example, it recommends that there be a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards made up of a majority of teachers who would certify teachers separately and independently from their degree programs and state licensing. The rationale behind this recommendation is that if teaching is ever to be a true profession, then teachers must have authority and responsibility in certifying teachers.

Another controversial element is the 48 billion dollar price tag spread over a 10 year implementation period. Exactly where this money will come from is not clear, although the argument is made that most, if not all, could come from maintaining the proportion of the nation's resources that has gone into education in the recent past.

This report is part of a second round of teaching reform proposals. The first round began in April of 1983 with *A Nation At Risk*. Round one focused on standards and reversing the decline in performance of schools, while round two appears to be focusing on implementation strategies to achieve higher standards and the creation of a profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities.

As with other reform agenda, the intent is to strengthen the status of teaching, but the specific recommendations may or may not help to achieve this goal.

There are features of the report which most educators would support.

1. Higher relative salaries for teachers in a range from $15,000 - 72,000.
2. Improved working conditions, including service and staff help for teachers and modern technology to assist in allowing them to become more productive in working with students.
3. Strategies to attract minorities into teaching. Interventions in pre-college education are suggested along with federal fellowship programs. (This is the only area where federal funding is proposed, and Secretary of Education Bennett already has indicated that he will not support this or any program which is exclusive by race.)
4. Additional funding for teachers and schools.
5. Teachers are encouraged to assume a revised role and to have more authority and opportunities within school settings to exercise professional judgement and to make important school instructional and other policy decisions.
6. Teaching is viewed as an intellectual activity requiring people of substantial intellectual accomplishment.
7. Higher standards for teacher preparation and the teaching profession.
8. Restructuring teacher preparation. Arts and science faculty are encouraged to work together with education faculty and university presidents to bring needed attention to the preparation of teachers.
9. Extended university preparation is associated with advancing the professionalization of teaching. Graduate-level university coursework is recommended for all fully-certified teachers. A master's degree is also suggested for a fully-certified teacher.
10. Internships and residency programs.
11. Close cooperation between SCDEs and school districts. Sharing personnel is advocated in building strong teacher preparation programs.
12. Differentiated staffing and the idea of having different and advanced certificates for experienced and proven-effective teachers.
13. Teacher advancement is based upon more than scores on paper-and-pencil, multiple-choice tests.
14. An equitable distribution of talented teachers is proposed to prevent the congregation of talent in the most desirable settings. Pay incentives are proposed.
15. Emergency licenses and teaching out of one's field are renounced. States are encouraged to announce a date beyond which both will not be allowed.

In general, the report encourages the selection of teaching as a career. Teaching is presented as rewarding, exciting and important work. The Task Force asserts the primacy of education as the foundation of economic growth, equal opportunity, and a shared national vision of excellence in the United States. Because of this, teacher educators will find much to praise in the report and its recommendations.

But the creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards is a revolutionary idea surrounded by questions. How or why it should function apart from state standards boards is not clear. State standards boards can be strengthened. In most states they have not yet been created. The Task Force argues for a

National Board to help in an increasingly mobile society. There is certainly some support for this idea. For example, the Commissioner of Education in Connecticut favors moving in this direction because Connecticut recruits 50 percent of its teachers from out of state where standards are beyond control. Others will argue that teachers who desire to show that they are particularly well qualified by anyone's standards should have an opportunity to do so.

A National Board, however, could create additional bureaucracy. This particular recommendation is probably the most revolutionary one in the report. It represents a significant departure from past and present practice and could be considered a challenge to state responsibilities delegated by the federal Constitution.

One also might wonder about the consistency of a reform agenda which on one hand supports the decentralization of decision making in schools (to the extent of disrupting the research-supported and common practice of school principal as instructional leader) and on the hand, supports the creation of another national bureaucracy for certification. Bureaucracies tend to be rigid and to limit professional judgment.

A major question arises as to whether or not a National Board is needed to certify and recertify teachers. The logistics involved in creating this National Board will be complex, costly, political, and perhaps counterproductive. The Board is to be formed by June 1987, and to begin issuing certificates in three to four years.

Already the Carnegie Corporation has awarded Stanford University $817,000 to study how the Board might assess teachers. An effort will be mounted to determine what teachers need to know and do. Apparently, written tests of subject-matter knowledge, computer simulations, and observations of teaching will be examined and/or developed. How the effort will relate to previous state and university efforts, to the National Teacher Examinations (NTE), to NASDTEC and NCATE accreditation remains to be seen.

The proposed national certification system is voluntary. How consistent will it be with the Task Force recommendation to encourage minorities to enter teaching? Experience suggests that a national exam will not be of benefit to minorities. Gregory R. Anrig, president of the Educational Testing Service, believes that the Task Force hope of raising teaching standards without hurting minority groups is simply not realistic. He has predicted an adverse impact on minorities.

The creation of a new level of authority in teacher certification might also lead to buck-passing. Some critics of a National Board fear that an individual national exam and candidate-centered assessment might render program and teacher preparation unit approval, NCATE, NASDTEC and state accreditation agencies obsolete. With these already in existence, are we not duplicating efforts? There already is a system of national standards in teacher preparation and reciprocity agreements in place. Why not support these rather than develop a new system? Much progress has been made in recent years in the variety of tests chosen by states to measure elements of teacher competence, from basic skills to classroom performance. The nation must not start anew on this effort, or disconnect it from teacher preparation programs in IHEs.

Some states may be hostile toward a National Board and may view it as an infringement on their legal responsibility. Some states simply will ignore the idea.

The Carnegie decision to immediately invest $817,000 in this effort could well be offensive to some financially-troubled state agencies struggling for pennies, yet charged with a similar function (certifying teachers). The decision to move ahead before consultation with state agencies could be perceived as arrogance, in that the Carnegie Forum plans to move ahead whether or not states or anybody else approves or supports the idea.

There are other features of the report which raise questions:

1. Does not using student test scores to judge teacher productivity and to determine pay constitute misuse of data? Teacher compensation should be linked to certificates, performance and experience, but only very cautiously, if at all, with student test performance which is influenced by many factors beyond teacher control. As mentioned in the Carnegie report, no method of measuring student performance and linking it directly to teacher rewards is yet satisfactory.
2. Does the report adequately recognize current teacher preparation reform efforts which in several states have been extensive and worthy of note? Many IHEs, SEAs and LEAs have invested major resources and efforts recently to improve teacher preparation and schooling.
3. Is a single model for teacher preparation feasible, practical or desirable for all states? Diversity in approach to teacher preparation is necessary because of geographic, institutional, cultural and several other factors critical to the design and successful implementation of teacher preparation programs.
4. Was not the Carnegie reform agenda developed in some isolation from practicing classroom teachers, principals, school board members, superintendents, state education agency personnel, teacher educators and others directly affected by the recommendations?
5. Do not the recommendations imply that teachers are doing poor jobs and that they need externally imposed restructuring of the system? The intent is to rebuild and not repair. This intent will offend many.
6. Does not the report ignore the roles of principals, superintendents and school boards in implementing reform proposals and in establishing healthy working conditions in schools? Principal organizations declare that the report ignores two decades of research about the necessity of strong leadership by the school principal as a significant factor in developing effective schools.
7. Could not introducing into public schools choice and marketplace strategies, such as open enrollment and free agent teacher contracts, have negative effects on a public school system concerned with enrollment and teacher balance?
8. What reason is there to believe that schools would give preference to National Board certified teachers in hiring, promotion and salaries? Many districts hire lesser qualified teachers to save money, promote from within, and do not give salary credit for experiences gained in unfamiliar or experimental settings.

Also, it appears to be an error to insist that the package of recommendations must be accepted in total. It is very unlikely that all recommendations will be implemented simultaneously or as a package. Some recommendations and suggested actions are more necessary than others. This all-or-nothing approach will render the report less likely to be implemented. Also, the impact of the report will not be determined by how well its weakest link holds up.

The 48 billion dollar price tag associated with the Carnegie Task Force report is high and will require a 2.8 percent real increase in total spending on public elementary and secondary education in each of the next 10 years. Sustaining a reform agenda of this magnitude and for this long will be difficult if not impossible. The report proposes a national solution to essentially local problems at a time when state funding is tight and federal funds are decreasing.

The NEA president, who represents two-thirds of American teachers, expects the Carnegie plan to produce heated debate for several years and that at least a decade will go by before provisions might be implemented (Teacher Unions..., p. 22). In their Summer 1986 conventions, both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers took official stands on portions of the Carnegie Task Force report. The AFT also issued its own report, "The Revolution That Is Overdue," which will help to keep attention centered on the reform movement in teacher education and the teaching profession for the remainder of 1986 and in 1987.

Perhaps the questions raised about the Task Force report are not valid. The Task Force claims that it can implement a national exam without imposing a nationalized curriculum, and that it can make quality and equality of opportunity compatible.

Perhaps the cost of the system will not be prohibitive. Carnegie is paying the start-up costs, and later the system is supposed to run on fees paid by those licensed. Maybe state and local taxes will provide the $26-27 billion needed to raise teacher salaries. Although many polls show that Americans are relatively satisfied with their schools, they also show voters willing to finance increases in school expenditures if improvements in performance follow.

Governors and legislators are working on a five-year plan for reforming education. The governor of New Jersey, who is chairman of the National Governor's Association, has said that there will be no major conflicts with the report. (He was a member of the Task Force.) Governors, legislators and others buying into the reform agenda may indeed convince state and local authorities to fund the recommendations.

Perhaps the business sector will be convinced that economic prosperity and profitable corporations in this country are dependent upon reform in teaching and schooling, and as a result they will invest even more in education. Foundation support and private funds may continue to emerge and may expand to support the reform agenda.

But, the idea of a National Board raises some serious questions. Other parts of the report are more encouraging and if proper consultative strategies are employed to gain support for the recommendations, then the report does in fact have a chance of revolutionizing and advancing teaching and education as a profession.

REPORT RELATIONSHIPS

One might wonder at this point how well the reform agenda contained within the three reports fit together. With the chair of the Holmes Group steering committee also serving as a member of the Carnegie Task Force, differences between these two reports probably are reduced. There are many similarities in these and other reform reports for teacher education and the teaching/education profession. The similarities are also partly the result of the AFT and NEA presidents serving on several of the groups studying the problems and making recommendations. Since there is a growing body of educational literature comparing the various reports, little emphasis is placed in this Report on comparing and contrasting elements. The reader may find helpful, however, the following Visions of Reform Matrix designed to summarize some of the major elements in the three reform proposals.

VISIONS OF REFORM MATRIX

	NCATE Redesign	Holmes Group	Carnegie Forum
Recruit Minority Teachers	X	X	X
Require Basic Skills and Liberal Arts Background	X	X	X
Ensure Subject-Matter Competence	X	X	X
Develop Clinical Experiences and Demonstration Schools	X	X	X
Promote Internships and Residencies	X	X	X
Support Teacher Induction	X	X	X
Encourage Multiple Evaluations	X	X	X
Implement a Systematic Knowledge Base	X	X	X
Develop a Coherent Professional Curriculum	X	X	X
Provide Additional Resources for Teacher Preparation	X	X	X
Encourage Experimentation and Innovation	X		
Develop School Technology	X		X
Increase Teacher Responsibilities and Authority		X	X
Require Bachelor's Degree Prior to Professional Study		X	X
Extend Formal Preparation and Certification Period		X	X
Admit Novices Contingent Upon Testing		X	X
Differentiate Career Opportunities		X	X
Improve Teacher Salaries and Working Conditions		X	X
Relate Student Performance and Teacher Incentives			X
Create a National Board			X
Eliminate Undergraduate Education Majors		X	X

Part II

Implications for the Education Profession

STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

The roles and responsibilities of state education agencies are complex and comprehensive. Thus, a categorical structure is presented for identifying, grouping and discussing the implications of NCATE Redesign, the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum for state education agencies. The categories include policy development, leadership/assistance, monitoring/evaluation, and marketing.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The successful implementation of the differentiated teaching profession proposed by the Carnegie Forum and the Holmes Group will require the development and adoption of new state policies and/or new interpretations of existing state and interstate policies governing teaching and teacher education. *Assuming a commitment to implement the recommendations from these reports by the governing state agency or board,* current state standards and procedures will have to be measured against the three-tiered system of teacher licensing proposed by the Holmes Group and the two-level certification structure proposed by the Carnegie Forum. The NCATE Redesign will allow institutions of higher education to develop their teacher education programs within these structures. The flexibility of NCATE Standards can be used to incorporate the specific competencies of the Holmes and Carnegie differentiated structures as a basis for teacher education programs. Specific state standards also will need to be addressed in these teacher education programs.

The hierarchy of roles and responsibilities assigned by the Holmes Group to instructors, professional teachers, and career professional teachers and by the Carnegie Forum to teachers and advanced teachers, will be inconsistent generally with current policies for the issuance of the initial professional certificate that are based upon the successful completion of either an approved teacher education program or a credit-count process. Approved programs assume a cohesive structure of general education, content specialization, and professional education components based upon state standards. Recently, state policies have included standardized tests within and outside these approved programs as prerequisites for certification. These state-approved programs are normally delivered as undergraduate teacher education programs. Specialized areas requiring a master's degree such as school counselors, principals and reading specialists are delivered normally at the graduate level.

In view of discrepancies between current practise and the Holmes and Carnegie recommendations, state teacher education standards and certification/licensure criteria for entry into the profession and continuation in teaching will need to be developed, modified, and/or adopted by states to make these models legal and consistent with state policies. The NCATE Redesign, when implemented voluntarily by an institution of higher education, will need to accommodate these changes in structure, delivery and policy and be supportive of the respective state's interpretation of them. NCATE's scope of accreditation authority may become smaller with the elimination of the current undergraduate teacher education delivery system which currently is based upon the approved program concept and not upon individual candidate assessment.

Other policies will need to be developed and adopted for selecting, training and certifying career professional and lead teachers who are supervising instructors and other teachers not holding a professional certificate. Also, policies will need to be established for selecting substantially equivalent "substitute teachers" to cover the classes of career professional teachers and lead teachers while they are supervising, thereby maintaining high quality instruction for their students. To implement the Holmes model, standards and criteria for the intensive professional development course that instructors are required to take before they are issued a certificate and permitted to practice in a public school will need to be defined, developed, adopted, implemented and evaluated.

Numerous questions will be raised by the public and educators at all levels about the basic skills, content, and pedagogical tests proposed by Holmes, Carnegie and NCATE that prospective teachers must pass in each subject they will teach prior to certification. For example, how many tests will an elementary education teacher have to take? If a state does not adopt the Holmes or Carnegie differentiated structures, then prospective teachers may need to take the Holmes and/or Carnegie tests to meet university or National Board requirements and, in addition, other tests currently adopted by the governing state agency to meet approved program and/or certification criteria. The NCATE tests may or may not be another layer of testing, depending on how NCATE and state standards are interpreted. The costs to prospective teachers may be great.

Probably one of the most significant implications of the Holmes Group and Carnegie reports and NCATE Redesign Standards is whether or not program alignment can be achieved between the content of an arts and sciences degree, NCATE programs, and the public school content expected to be delivered, especially at the early childhood and middle childhood levels. Given the self-contained classroom delivery systems operating in most elementary schools, the issue will be whether or not schools will be able to recruit enough teachers with a multi-subject credential to deliver public school programs versus teachers who are prepared on the basis of an arts and sciences degree, subject-matter orientation. Furthermore, how will the teaching of basic reading, math and writing skills be accomplished by instructors who have not been prepared or assessed in these instructional skills because of the elimination of the professional education component at the undergraduate level?

The Holmes Group and Carnegie Forum recommend that teachers receive their initial professional certificate subsequent to the completion of a master's degree in teaching. This will not be possible without changing or reinterpreting many state policies regarding the issuance of the initial professional certificate. Moreover, how these interpretations are made will affect a state's status in complying with the provisions of interstate certification compacts concerning the issuance of the initial regular certificate as specified in the contracts. The requirement that a professional teacher must demonstrate competence as a teacher of academic subjects through the development of portfolios, other product measures, and planned exhibitions, will expand the notion of performance criteria for certification and will add a new feature to this level of certification in many states.

The development of criteria for certifying career professional teachers and lead

teachers will raise current state standards and requirements for the teaching profession. The notion of adding the doctorate, another content area, or demonstrating practical competence will expand current perceptions and expectations of the role of classroom teachers. The proposed changes in professional education, the study of education as a discipline, clinical experiences derived from job analyses, and related academic content at the higher education level are consistent with many state education agency school and instructional improvement projects. The Holmes Group initiative to facilitate changes from within the college/university infrastructure and the systemic approach of the Carnegie Forum to change local and state education systems are visionary and, when viewed together, provide a comprehensive programmatic direction as a basis for policy development that heretofore has not been available at the national level.

LEADERSHIP/ASSISTANCE

The Holmes Group and Carnegie Forum differentiated structures provide state education agencies with new opportunities for leadership and assistance services. State education agencies could help to improve the quality of instruction in public and higher education by disseminating field-tested curricular models, instructional delivery systems, evaluation policies/materials, and learning technology systems; issuing pilot program grants; providing educational improvement workshops in collaboration with public school and higher education staff; and collecting data relative to school and teacher training improvement. This approach calls for a *collaborative working relationship* on all common objectives affecting local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and state education agency program specialists. Collaboration of this nature will be consistent with many of the recommendations for partnerships between and among schools and universities identified in the Holmes and Carnegie reports, especially in the establishment and operation of professional development schools. In these schools program alignment between content and pedagogy at the public school and higher education levels could be accomplished more efficiently with state education agency involvement in terms of its human, fiscal and physical resources and statewide leadership roles and responsibilities.

State education agency program specialists could work with teacher educators in institutions of higher education concerning the direction of state and local policies regarding curriculum and instruction, teacher training and evaluation within the context of the differentiated professional models. Hence, resources could be coordinated to enhance preparation programs for lead teachers, career professionals, professional teachers and/or instructors.

Many of the recommendations of the Holmes Group presume a state leadership role for institutions of higher education. State education agencies are organized currently to implement this role. The Holmes Group approach may lead to role conflicts rather than collaborative working relationships. A model that recognizes the unique, and in many cases statutory, roles and responsibilities of local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and state education agencies in the context of the Holmes and Carnegie recommendations will be more productive in

coordinating resources, facilitating communications and helping educators, thereby supporting student development.

MONITORING/EVALUATION

The design, development, administration and funding of tests for instructors, professional teachers, career professional teachers, and lead teachers proposed by the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and, to some degree, the NCATE Redesign may lead to duplicative efforts. Because many states currently have teacher testing programs, fiscal implications alone will impact significantly on the success or failure of teacher testing as proposed by these groups. If the Holmes Group and Carnegie Forum propose to develop a new set of tests that may be used for state certification purposes, then the same assurances concerning broad-based involvement, equity, reliability, validity and adverse impact that state education agencies have addressed recently will become independent responsibilities of the Holmes Group institutions and the Carnegie National Board. The people, processes, time and resources needed to accomplish these tasks are significant. The Holmes Group proposal creates a new role for institutions of higher education because they will be developing and administering tests that might be used to issue or deny a teaching certificate. The Holmes Group report indicates, also, that its tests will be developed for use within five years. This is an unrealistic time frame given the demands involved beyond the conventional mission and activities of institutions of higher education. How will this be accomplished by state higher education systems given their current and projected state budgets for teacher education? Finally, the Holmes Group proposes that the on-the-job instructional competence of "instructors" be assured by qualified professional teachers. The criteria, procedures and instrumentation to achieve this are as immense a task as the development and operation of a teacher testing program. However, all of these proposed testing programs might be used by institutions of higher education to meet the NCATE standards.

MARKETING

The eventual success or failure of the Holmes Group, Carnegie Forum and NCATE Redesign proposals will depend on the needs and readiness of the individuals and groups proposed to implement them, or on those who are already duly authorized to govern and deliver education and teacher education at the state and local levels. The Carnegie and Holmes reports purport to *change* education significantly and not merely to modify it. The NCATE Redesign establishes standards for the improvement of the current system. Hence, a major "marketing" effort will be needed to implement the Carnegie and Holmes proposals. It will take an organizational development effort far beyond one that has ever been attempted in the past to realize the goals proposed by these groups. The involvement and services of such groups as the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Council of States for Inservice Education (NCSIE), and the Interstate Certification Contract Administrators Association (ICCAA) will be needed to make these proposals a reality. These groups are comprised of individuals appointed by chief state school of-

ficers to represent the states in the professional development of teachers. These individuals make daily decisions that affect recruitment, standards, certification and professional development. Their involvement through collaboration is essential to ensure success.

The following questions suggested by the Carnegie Forum and expanded herein establish a frame of reference for drawing implications for state education agencies.

1. Will state education agencies incorporate the Carnegie National Board standards, the Holmes differentiated structure, and/or NCATE Standards and processes into their policy structures? If so, how will they do it? Will they direct their resources toward changing the educational delivery system in the states, or will they attempt to improve within the current system?
2. Will state education agencies waive their state licensing requirements for teachers holding the Carnegie National Board certificate, the Holmes differentiated certificates, or completing an NCATE-approved teacher education program?
3. Will the state education agencies make the Carnegie National Board exam(s), the Holmes differentiated profession, or NCATE Standards prerequisite(s) to their state standards?

The Holmes Group and Carnegie Forum reports call for changing, in a mutually compatible fashion, institutions of higher education, the credentialling system, and the public schools. However, the development of the Holmes report did not include in its design process all of the constituencies that are affected by the Holmes Group proposals. The Carnegie Forum and NCATE Redesign did involve a more appropriate balance of education, private and governmental constituencies. The issue is whether or not the development strategies used by the groups will make a difference in the successful marketing and implementation of the recommendations. The Holmes Group report calls for changes in: the structure of traditional careers in teaching; the structure, standards and substance of teacher education; new partnerships between schools and colleges; and the nature of liberal arts instruction. Without the broad-based involvement of administrators, teachers, parents, state education agencies and professional organizations, the Holmes Group proposes to change these mutually supportive structures. Given past experiences and research findings concerning this type of planning process, the implications are clear. Those who were not involved will have a difficult time interpreting and accepting the proposed direction of the Holmes Group. State education agencies will be in constant conflict with the Holmes Group institutions because each group will be addressing independently similar tasks regarding standards, criteria, procedures and testing. Moreover, they will compete for the same state dollars to accomplish these tasks. Consequently, the probability of implementation of many praiseworthy and substantive recommendations of the Holmes Group appears low because of a closed design and development process. An irony of the Holmes report is that it calls for collaboration for the success of its implementation. On the other hand, the Carnegie report and especially NCATE Redesign have involved a wider variety of

people and groups. Experience and research findings indicate that these proposals will have a greater chance of success because of the shared wisdom, ownership and common visions that are needed for widespread, significant results.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BACHELOR'S-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS

IMPLICATIONS OF NCATE REDESIGN

The implementation of the NCATE Redesign may have a broad and pervasive impact on bachelor's-level institutions. The redesigned Standards encourage diversity, imagination and innovation in institutional planning, but also place constraints through preconditions. The organization/administration patterns of bachelor's-level institutions are varied (i.e., college of education, department of education in an arts and sciences division, or school of education), and will affect the ability of a given institution (unit) to secure accreditation.

The preconditions which must be met before the accreditation process begins will inhibit some institutions and, at the same time, give cause for NCATE to demonstrate adherence to its stated goals of encouraging diversity, imagination and innovation. Four of the preconditions which address prior state approval (#9), regional accreditation (#10), non-discriminatory equal opportunity (#11), and program graduates (#5) are restatements of existing standards. These preconditions should be attainable by institutions seeking accreditation. Three other preconditions for review by NCATE should be in place or easily implemented. Bachelor's-level institutions normally have a dean or director of teacher education (#2). Many state and regional accreditation standards call for regular evaluations of programs and graduates (#4). Similarly, since assessing the competence of graduates (#7) is mandated by most state departments, compliance should be easily documented.

The impact of the remaining preconditions on bachelor's-level institutions will be determined by the interpretations used. For example, the first precondition addresses the existence of a *unit* and its relationship to the institution at large. Given the nature of many of the small, liberal arts bachelor's-level institutions, the responsibility for making decisions is not always the sole purview of the education unit. Depending on the interpretation, many institutions would not meet the first precondition on unit definition unless the unit is defined as the total institution or the division in which the professional preparation occurs.

The third precondition on unit policies may create difficulties again related to the definition of "unit". Most institutions have policy manuals or constitutions and bylaws, but these may not exist for each unit within the institution. In many cases, the unit will of necessity have to be defined as the institution, or additional policy statements will have to be developed in order to comply with the precondition.

The interpretation of "program" as described in precondition #5 (students have graduated from the program) will affect undergraduate institutions. Many students who seek professional certification are graduates of content area programs and are therefore not counted as graduates of education programs, even though certificates

are recommended. If "program" implies those prepared and recommended for certification by the unit, then this condition could be met.

It may be difficult to implement precondition #6 (unit standardized assessment of basic skills prior to program admission) in those institutions which have established high entrance requirements and have administrative patterns which inhibit autonomy. For example, if an institution does not require students in other major areas to take admission tests, it may be difficult for education units to require them.

Compliance with precondition #8 (expecting a curriculum portfolio for each program) will demand greater effort from those institutions in states that are not recognized by NCATE. Since the focus of NCATE's accreditation process is on the ability of a unit to deliver quality programs and not on the programs themselves, bachelor's-level institutions will have to submit individual programs for review to national professional associations or work with the state departments to secure recognition.

Complying with the five Standards for accreditation will be the most challenging and perhaps difficult part of the process given the administrative pattern, size and location of a majority of the bachelor's-level institutions. Many teacher preparation units are configured as departments within broader arts and sciences divisions. These institutions are predominantly located in small towns and cities and often are in remote areas.

The first standard, "Knowledge Base for Professional Education," relates to the design, delivery and content of the curriculum. The design component contains one potentially difficult area for bachelor's-level institutions to achieve—providing experiences related to culturally diverse and exceptional populations. This may be an impossibility for many institutions except through vicarious experiences. Coherence among courses and experiences, purposes and outcomes will be difficult to orchestrate for institutions in which the unit does not experience the level of autonomy suggested in the Standards and preconditions.

The delivery and content components should be attainable by most institutions for the general education component is an area of strength for a majority of the bachelor's-level institutions. On the other hand, satisfying the specialty studies component requirements may prove difficult especially in the area of collaborative efforts between faculty in specialty areas and professional education. New structures and modes of delivery will have to be developed to provide experiences to demonstrate the interactive nature of the curriculum and the collaboration with public schools which is necessary for teacher education students.

"Relationships to the World of Practice," the second standard, addresses clinical and field-based experiences, relationships with graduates, and involvement with schools. Criteria for the clinical and field-based experiences component suggest two potential problem areas for the bachelor's-level institution. First, opportunities for experiences with culturally diverse and exceptional populations often do not exist if the area the unit serves has a somewhat homogeneous local student population. A second problem is the duration of the clinical experiences. Given the nature of most bachelor's-level institutions, the requirement of a 10-week minimum for the clinical experience would impinge upon either the broad liberal arts or

the specialty area preparation. Written agreements may also be difficult to secure depending upon the rules and regulations of the institution and participating school divisions. Efforts will have to be made to replace existing verbal agreements with more formal contractual arrangements. Maintaining relationships with graduates and providing assistance to first-year teachers may necessitate hiring additional faculty and therefore cause budget problems. However, many states are assuming some responsibility and/or partial costs for staff development during the induction period.

The third standard, "Students," addresses criteria for admission, monitoring student progress, advisory services, and assessing competence prior to completion of a program. The bachelor's-level institutions may have difficulty meeting the standard for admission criteria. Of particular difficulty will be the recruitment of applicants from diverse economies, racial and cultural backgrounds. Also, the required 2.5 minimum GPA may be contrary to institutional policies.

Standard four, "Faculty," concerns qualifications and assignments, faculty load, faculty development and evaluation. The expectation that all faculty members in professional education units in bachelor's-level institutions will have terminal degrees may create hardships for many such institutions. Without master's-level faculty with expertise, these institutions would not exist. The determining factor will again be related to the definition of "exceptional" expertise. A faculty load for undergraduate instruction of 12 semester hours will place constraints on many bachelor's-level institutions. Loads of 12 to 15 semester hours are common since teaching rather than research is emphasized. Complying with the criteria for faculty evaluation will be difficult if scholarly performance is narrowly defined and/or restricted to publication records.

"Governance and Resources," the fifth standard, addresses personnel, funding, physical facilities and equipment, and structures of governance. This standard should have minimal impact on bachelor's-level institutions. The one exception may be related to a unit's authority. Complete autonomy does not exist in a majority of the bachelor's-level institutions; and, therefore, the unit does not have complete control over its destiny. Complying with personnel resource needs may necessitate reassignment of faculty and realignment of responsibilities. Since many undergraduate institutions focus on total institutional needs, professional education units may not always receive resources adequate for their specific goals and missions.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HOLMES GROUP

The goal of making the nation's schools a better place for teachers to work and learn as called for in *Tomorrow's Teachers*, the Holmes Group report, is commendable. However, implementation of the recommendations which calls for the master's degree as the only format for teacher preparation, will impact negatively on the more than 500 bachelor's-level institutions which currently prepare a large number of our nation's teachers. Since many of these institutions are prohibited from offering graduate programs by state statutes, efforts will have to be made to seek approval for graduate programs or these institutions will be forced to withdraw from their historic position in teacher preparation.

Although the intent of the Holmes Group is to enhance the quality of preparation programs, simply eliminating bachelor's-level institutions as partners in the enterprise of teacher preparation may be contradictory. The teaching behaviors that are so strongly advocated by the Holmes Group may best be exemplified in the bachelor's-level institutions. In most cases, the professed strength of these institutions lies in the fact that highly-qualified subject-matter specialists do the actual teaching because excellence in teaching is the thrust of the institution.

Further, evidence has yet to be presented that would ensure that what is now assumed to be accomplished by prospective teachers in four years could be masterfully accomplished in one or two. In reality the content of courses or programs elevated to the graduate level may be little different than the content of courses or programs currently existing at the undergraduate level. Until such evidence is presented, it would seem that the efforts to prepare teachers for a multi-cultural constituency could best be accomplished through a system of diverse programs at all levels.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CARNEGIE FORUM

Some of the Carnegie Forum recommended changes could improve the practicing professional directly; e.g., the inclusion of teachers in the decision-making process, the utilization of differentiated staffing patterns, and the provision of salaries and career opportunities that compare favorably with other professions. However, these recommendations do not speak directly to the preparation of teachers.

There are two recommendations in particular which do address the need for changes in the preparation programs through which prospective teachers move. The report suggests that future teachers acquire a bachelor's degree in arts and sciences. A second suggestion calls for the creation of a new professional curriculum in graduate schools leading to a Master in Teaching degree. The implementation of these two recommendations will have dramatic impact on bachelor's-level institutions which have undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

Abolishing the major in education will in effect abolish the programs and, in most situations, preclude the bachelor's-level institutions from directly participating in the teacher preparation process. Since bachelor's-level institutions do not have graduate programs, their options would be limited. Graduate programs could be created either independently or via consortia arrangements. A second option might be to enter into relationships with institutions which currently have graduate programs in a manner analogous to current relationships which exist between many community colleges and four-year institutions. The development of linkages which would provide the vertical articulation necessary for bachelor's-level institutions to be participants in the preparation of the nation's future teachers would be crucial for the implementation of either option.

STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

In this section the phrase "state colleges and universities" will be used to designate a group of institutions that differ from both the small, liberal arts (often

independent) institutions and the large, research-oriented (usually public) universities. In general, the phrase applies to institutions similar to those that are members of the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU).

However, there are substantial differences within this general category of institutions—some are historically black; some private institutions may fit this description; many are residential, but some are not; many have graduate programming in education at one or more levels, although some have only undergraduate programming; some have histories as "teachers colleges"; and, there is a wide range of sizes represented.

What is common among these institutions is a substantial commitment to the preparation of teachers and other certified personnel. These are the institutions that produce the majority of the nation's teachers and other school personnel.

As far as the three reform reports are concerned, the potential impact on this group of state colleges and universities can be divided into two broad categories. One category is "direct impact." In general, this category consists of recommendations and determinations that are addressed specifically to teacher education institutions.

The other category is second- or third-order "indirect impact." Two of the reports—the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum—address recommendations to constituencies other than teacher education institutions. However, as these other constituencies address the recommendations, there is likely to be (in at least some instances) a second- or third-level impact on teacher education institutions, especially the state colleges and universities. The determination of potential effects on state colleges and universities becomes speculative, largely depending on the extent to which the recommendations are accepted and implemented by the other constituencies. There are likely to be substantial geographical differences among these indirect impacts, as well as substantial differences among subcategories of state colleges and universities.

IMPLICATIONS OF NCATE REDESIGN

State colleges and universities have traditionally supported and actively participated in NCATE. One has only to skim the NCATE *Annual List* to see a support pattern in many states.

Further, the higher education segment of the NCATE leadership, at least in recent years, seems to have come substantially from persons associated with this general type of institution. Many such persons have participated in the development of the NCATE Redesign.

Therefore, NCATE Redesign is not likely to be a highly controversial item as it impacts collectively on the state colleges and universities. The traditional interest in and support of NCATE accreditation is likely to continue at these institutions.

However, it must be recognized that individual institutions (and perhaps even some subcategories of institutions) among state colleges and universities take exception to or will have difficulty meeting some of the new preconditions and Standards. For example, the additional emphasis on use of research findings in curriculum design and, especially, an increased emphasis on scholarly activity, will

require changes in practices in some institutions. Some of the new expectations in terms of resources (faculty development, faculty teaching load, faculty/student ratios, etc.) will be problems at some institutions. Some institutions, especially those serving relatively large numbers of minority students, have concerns about the potential impact of additional expectations for use of test data and other such measures for admission and exit requirements.

Overall, it appears that the impact on state colleges and universities of the NCATE Redesign will be less stressful than some of the recommendations of the other two reform proposals scrutinized in this Report.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HOLMES GROUP

In general, state colleges and universities are supportive of some Holmes Group recommendations and non-supportive of others. In some cases, there is such concern about the processes used by the Holmes Group that the recommendations are essentially dismissed without examination. Collectively, this group of institutions has been particularly offended by the "elitist" approach of the Holmes Group. In somewhat oversimplified terms, this group of institutions perceives the Holmes Group organizers as a group of institutions not substantially involved in teacher preparation but attempting to dictate to institutions substantially involved in teacher preparation how they should go about their business. Collectively, this group of institutions has been bewildered, if not offended, by the selection of 123 institutions invited to become the official charter members of the Holmes Group.

Setting aside the processes by which the recommendations were formulated, but with concern about what appears to be lack of clarity and inconsistency among the recommendations, this group of institutions finds itself with a variety of opinions about the particular recommendations.

Elimination of Undergraduate Programs Perhaps the most sensitive issue to the state colleges and universities as a group is the proposal "to phase out the undergraduate education major in member institutions and to develop in its place a graduate professional program in teacher education."

Some—but so far a small minority—of the state colleges and universities support this proposal. In a few states (e.g., California) the issue is or may become moot as forces other than the recommendations of the Holmes Group already have moved in this direction. However, in still other states with current or anticipated substantial shortages of teachers in some or many fields, there is a strong feeling that such a move, while perhaps defensible in the abstract, would make a bad situation worse. Those who hold this view sometimes argue that this could actually result in a net *reduction* of quality as school districts are pressured into putting inadequately prepared persons in classrooms.

Should the elimination of undergraduate programming become popular, the possible implications for state colleges and universities are:

1. State colleges and universities that currently offer only undergraduate programming would offer, at most, just some sort of a "pre-teaching" curriculum. Programs would be eliminated and faculty would be reassigned or

dismissed. The number of institutions offering teacher preparation would be reduced.

2. In many cases pedagogical content, now considered to be of undergraduate level and quality, would be given graduate-level labeling. Master's-level programs probably would be watered down and tend to become longer. In order to include all the necessary content, coursework would be accelerated, redundancies (if any) would be removed, less important content would be eliminated, instructional corners would be cut, and students would be expected to be more self-directed.
3. There would be a reduction in the number of persons interested in or eligible to become teachers if preparation were only at the graduate level.

Redevelopment of the Pedagogical Curriculum The Holmes Group commits itself "to a thorough reassessment of the pedagogical curriculum and to the development of a strong, coherent program of professional education in this area." In general, state colleges and universities applaud the efforts of the Holmes Group to improve instruction in pedagogy. If current practices in Holmes Group institutions are neither strong nor coherent, they should be. However, in general, state colleges and universities are asking if Holmes Group members are implying that *all* teacher education programs are neither strong nor coherent. If so, offense can be taken by some state colleges and universities which can point with considerable pride to strong programs whose graduates are eagerly sought by employing school districts.

If this recommendation is accepted, the effect on state colleges and universities is most likely to be that all curricula, no matter how strong, are going to become suspect. Pressures are likely to be brought to bear to alter curricula. In some cases this will be desirable; in other cases, it may become an instance of "change for the sake of change."

Clinical Experiences The Holmes Group commits itself to strengthening clinical experience to relate more closely to systematic development of practice. In general, this proposal could be strongly supported by state colleges and universities, many of which have long experience with constantly improving field-experience components.

The effect of acceptance of this recommendation may be minimal on state colleges and universities because of already generally-strong, field-experience components. However, there could be problems with pressures to alter the nature, location, length and place in the program of various field experiences.

Differentiated Structure The Holmes Group commits itself to the development of a three-tier differentiated structure consisting of the career professional teacher, the professional teacher, and the instructor. In general, state colleges and universities view this proposal as it affects two constituencies.

One constituency is the school district, because this proposal speaks strongly to how a district assigns and uses personnel. State colleges and universities have virtually no control or influence over how school districts assign or use personnel. In this sense, the recommendation is essentially irrelevant to state colleges and universities except in those localities in which school districts adopt a particular

staffing pattern requiring individuals prepared to perform certain instructional roles.

Viewed in another way, at least some state colleges and universities raise a question as to why the recommendation has been made. Those state colleges and universities that offer programming for teachers through the master's and specialist (sixth-year) levels generally hold that what is identified as the career professional teacher ("capable of assuming responsibility not only within the classroom but also at the school level") does not differ appreciably from what is now being done at the specialist level. Similarly, what is identified as the "professional teacher" ("a fully autonomous professional in the classroom") may not differ appreciably from what is now being done at the master's level (assuming a teaching credential based on the baccalaureate degree and augmented by the master's program). The rationale for the "instructor" role is questioned in terms of whether or not having such a role is a desirable practice.

The impact on state colleges and universities of general acceptance of this recommendation is not clear. One approach may be to make essentially cosmetic changes. What is now labeled as appropriate curricula at the master's and specialist levels may be relabeled as the curricula for "professional teachers" and "career professional teachers," respectively. With changes in nomenclature, another approach may be to make minor changes in programming to reflect roles as they may be defined operationally in school districts in the service area of a state college or university. Still another approach may be to initiate programming, at levels not presently offered by an institution, to prepare persons for these roles. In general, state colleges and universities are probably going to be responsive to whatever degree and nature of implementation of this recommendation is adopted by state certification agencies and area school districts.

Changes in Graduate Programs The Holmes Group members support using their influence to change state and local policy to create a specific type of differentiated structure for teaching roles. It is not likely that state colleges and universities will eagerly and enthusiastically join in this movement unless there is some evidence at the school district level that such a structure is effective in practice. As a result, there is likely to be some degree of conflict within states and local areas between the Holmes Group members who are advocating such a structure and state colleges and universities who are less than enthusiastic about it.

Professional Teacher Examinations The Holmes Group commits itself to develop and administer a series of professional teacher examinations that provide a responsible basis for decisions on entry to the profession. For many state colleges and universities, this represents a recommendation—at least in concept—of a fait accompli. The NCATE Redesign incorporates the use of test data in admitting students to programs. Some of the regional accrediting associations are moving rapidly toward "outcomes assessment." Roughly half the states, especially concentrated in the Southeast, already have some sort of testing program for beginning (and, in some cases, experienced) teachers.

State colleges and universities will look closely at the wording, intent and implementation of this recommendation. If, on the one hand, the recommendation is essentially a call for accountability through the use of appropriate assessment

devices which may vary among localities, the reaction of state colleges and universities is likely to be one of "we've already done that" or "we are making substantial progress toward that." If, on the other hand, the recommendation is essentially support for the kind of effort underway by the Carnegie Forum in implementing a new series of national and state boards for essentially common testing of teachers using the same or similar instruments, then the reaction will be predictably different.

The impact on state colleges and universities of acceptance of this recommendation is likely to be divided. The division, likely to be along the lines of the "haves" and "have nots," results from resources available to create or maintain programs matriculating students who can perform effectively on examinations. Another division may be between the historically white and historically black institutions. In the case of the latter, many examination structures (especially paper-and-pencil formats) are viewed with suspicion in light of the history of relatively poor performance of minority students on such instruments.

Demonstration of Mastery through Multiple Evaluations The Holmes Group supports multiple measures of teaching performance. Interestingly, this recommendation is likely to receive considerably stronger support from state colleges and universities than the general concept of testing itself. This is not only due to a recognition of the limitations of standardized testing in predicting success as a teacher, but also due to the Holmes Group's support of measures of teaching performance (over which the SCDEs generally have control) rather than an emphasis on knowledge of subject(s) to be taught, which is often under the control of an arts and sciences unit.

The possible implications of the implementation of this recommendation for state colleges and universities are:

1. State colleges and universities probably will accept this recommendation with some degree of interest and support. In general, state colleges and universities are eager and proud to show what their products can *do*, but there is some degree of opposition to showing what they *know*, as measured in conventional ways.
2. State colleges and universities probably will cooperate with members of the Holmes Group and other agencies supporting this recommendation in bringing about its acceptance in those localities where something of this sort has not already been in place.

Minorities in Teacher Education The Holmes Group members commit themselves to significantly increasing the number of minorities in *their* teacher education programs. State colleges and universities will view this recommendation in two ways. If, on the one hand, the recommendation is generally a call for increasing the number of well-qualified minorities entering teaching, there will be strong support. State colleges and universities include a number of institutions with special traditions in and commitments to blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities. If, on the other hand, the recommendation is to be taken literally, and it is a call to increase minority enrollments in Holmes Group institutions, the recom-

mendation will be viewed in quite another way. Recognizing that the pool of talented minority students who can be recruited into teaching is limited, there will be a scramble among institutions to attract these students. The traditionally black institutions may find yet another erosion of the talent pool on which they may draw.

The acceptance of this recommendation is likely to have the following effects on state colleges and universities:

1. Traditionally black institutions and other institutions that serve appreciable numbers of prospective minority teachers will be threatened by the recommendation.
2. The majority of state colleges and universities will support the recommendation in principle; i.e., that more well-qualified minorities should be recruited into teaching.
3. All institutions will become more competitive for the limited talent pool of minority persons that can be recruited into teaching. For individual minority persons, the effect is likely to be positive, as financial aid and other incentives increase.
4. Institutions will be frustrated in accomplishing the goal of attracting more minority persons. Scarce institutional resources may be diverted into financial aid for minority persons, especially in the absence of increased federal and state assistance for this purpose.

Professional Development Schools The Holmes Group advocates the establishment of professional development schools and increased partnerships between teacher education institutions and K-12 schools. In general, state colleges and universities may be supportive of this arrangement, at least partly because somewhat similar arrangements already exist in many places.

A small number of campus laboratory schools remain. Some of these are affiliated with state colleges and universities. Their stated purpose is to accomplish many of the objectives set forth for the professional development schools. Other state colleges and universities have arrangements with local schools to accomplish much the same purpose(s). In virtually all instances, state colleges and universities would agree that current arrangements could be broadened and strengthened. In this respect, the recommendation of the Holmes Group will be supported.

The possible implications of the implementation of this recommendation for state colleges and universities are:

1. There is likely to be varying degrees of support, depending on the structures and arrangements currently in place among institutions. To the extent that school districts are supportive of the concept as well, improvements and moves toward full implementation of the concept can be made easier.
2. Additional costs will be involved, and state colleges and universities will weigh these against the improvements in programming that are likely to result.
3. Alternative staffing patterns, both on the part of schools and on the part of the state colleges and universities, will be required. There will be anywhere

from minor to major difficulties in working these out.

4. Changes in roles will be required. Teacher education faculty not presently expected to be substantially involved in experimentation and research will have to cultivate these roles. The role of the practitioner in the teacher education program may be altered somewhat as well.

In summary, state colleges and universities find that they can and will be able to support, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, the Holmes Group recommendations, partially depending on the extent to which these recommendations apply only to the Holmes Group or to all teacher education programs. On the other hand, there will be a lack of enthusiasm for (or opposition to) some of the Holmes Group recommendations based on both the substance of the recommendations and the way in which the recommendations were developed.

The effect on practice remains to be seen. State colleges and universities are likely to be more influenced by the extent to which the substance of the recommendations is adopted by area school districts and state education agencies than by the actions of their nearby Holmes Group members.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CARNEGIE FORUM

There are eight major recommendations of the Carnegie Forum. Three of these recommendations impact directly on teacher education programs of state colleges and universities. The other five have a potentially significant, but more indirect, effect on these programs.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards In general, teacher education programs in state colleges and universities are likely to have, at most, lukewarm support of this proposal. In the past, these institutions, in addition to taking their own initiatives, have generally followed the lead of external groups that have mandated—or applied pressure for—various program requirements and changes, derived from state certification requirements, state legislation, NCATE, professional standards boards, state teacher testing programs, and elsewhere. Acceptance of the National Board concept by state colleges and universities may depend more on the content of and delivery system(s) for the preparation program(s) than on the concept itself; and also on how representative the Board is of the profession in general.

To the extent that this determination agrees with what the faculty of a given institution believes is good practice, research-based, and congruent with other state and local factors, there will be agreement with the National Board concept. Further, the extent to which an institution's graduates are successful in "passing the Boards," will tend to increase the institution's acceptance of the concept.

On the other hand, the Carnegie Forum makes no recommendation as to how (or if) resources are to be obtained to support changed or upgraded teacher education programs in the state colleges and universities to produce National Board-certified teachers. This lack of support for the means to accomplish improved teacher preparation programs is not likely to create support for the National Board concept.

The possible implications for state colleges and universities of the implementation of this recommendation are:

1. There will be an increased competitiveness among state colleges and universities to produce Board-certified teachers. This factor may, in turn, produce a kind of "teaching for the test" or an undesirable homogenization of preparation programs.
2. State colleges and universities may find themselves with conflicting or contradictory expectations in terms of preparing teachers. At least at the outset, state certification requirements, institutional requirements, NCATE requirements, and Board-determined expectations may not be identical or even similar. Teacher education, already unusually heavily regulated, may become even more so, with the attendant frustration from incompatible external forces.
3. Students may gravitate toward institutions with high pass rates on the Boards. States may penalize state colleges and universities with low pass rates, even though some of these institutions may be serving appreciable numbers of prospective minority teachers. Some state colleges and universities may find it necessary to reduce programming and reduce staff, while others may experience growth.

Bachelor's Degree Prerequisite The recommendation of a requirement of a bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching is essentially the same recommendation made by the Holmes Group. (See the discussion on this point in the Holmes Group section.)

Master in Teaching Degree The recommendation of a professional curriculum in graduate schools of education for a Master in Teaching degree, based on a systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in the schools, has many similarities to the Holmes Group proposals for clinical experience and for a differentiated structure for the teaching force. Coupled with the Board certification of "teachers" and "advanced teachers," the Carnegie Forum recommendation seems to imply much the same as the two upper levels of differentiated structure in the Holmes Group recommendations. The reaction to this Carnegie Forum recommendation among state colleges and universities is likely to be similar to the reaction to the Holmes Group proposal.

Professional Environment for Teachers The Carnegie Forum proposal to restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teachers, "freeing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress," is not one that affects state colleges and universities directly.

The indirect implications for state colleges and universities could be considerable. The recommendation implies a level of professional maturity not always currently found among teachers, especially beginning teachers. To the extent that this recommendation is implemented, there will be an expectation on the part of school district leaders that all teachers will have a greater knowledge of curriculum, learning theory, and instructional strategies than is now the case. In order to have their graduates hired to teach in the kind of school envisioned, state colleges and universities often will have to alter programs to ensure that graduates are well prepared to perform successfully in the independent manner that this recommen-

dation implies. At the same time, preparation will have to be accomplished with a smaller amount of contact with the student than is now typically the case.

The possible implications for state colleges and universities of the implementation of this recommendation are:

1. Curricula will be revised to give more attention to teaching and learning theory, individualizing instruction, use of tests and test data, methodologies, use of instructional resources, diagnosis and remediation, and counseling and referral skills to make the teacher an independent, accountable practitioner.
2. Not all potential teachers will be able to reach desirable levels of maturity as independent practitioners—at least in the initial attempt. Therefore, the curricula and instructional delivery systems of state colleges and universities will have to model, at least in part, the kind of instructional approach taught to prospective teachers. Teacher educators will have to diagnose and remediate the shortcomings of the prospective teacher; learning will have to be more individualized. However, not all prospective teachers can be remediated to satisfactory levels. These persons will probably be removed from the programs—with all the implications that such actions have on both quality and size of a program.

Lead Teachers The Carnegie Forum concept of a lead teacher—one with the "proven ability to provide active leadership in the redesign of the schools and in helping colleagues to uphold high standards of learning and teaching"—does not seem to be appreciably different from the Holmes Group concept of the career professional teacher. This proposal for the internal restructuring of schools does not appear to have a direct impact on teacher preparation programs in state colleges and universities.

Questions will arise about how this role (and the preparation for this role) differs from what is now being done in many state colleges and universities to prepare teachers at the post-master's level, to prepare instructional supervisors, and to prepare certain types of administrative personnel (especially principals and assistant principals). If the role of the lead teacher emerges as a significant one, other kinds of roles will change—and the preparation programs for these other kinds of roles will have to change as well.

The effect of the adoption of this recommendation on state colleges and universities is likely to be one of "wait and see" how school districts in each institution's service area organize themselves and what kind of professional roles they define operationally. State colleges and universities can—and probably will—then organize preparation programs to correspond with the professional roles that are defined.

Minority Teachers The Carnegie Forum proposes to mobilize the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers. This recommendation is likely to be supported by state colleges and universities much more strongly than the Holmes Group recommendation concerning minority teachers. The Holmes Group recommendation calls for members to recruit more minority per-

sons to teaching, thus implying that more of the talented minorities should be prepared at Holmes Group institutions.

The Carnegie Forum gives more attention to preparation of minorities at a wider range of institutions, thus maintaining an appropriate role for state colleges and universities. The Carnegie Forum appropriately places much of the responsibility for recruiting able minority students into teaching on federal, state and local agencies other than teacher education units, although the SCDEs are not without their share of the responsibility. This approach is likely to be widely supported by the teacher education units in state colleges and universities.

The impact on the teacher education units of state colleges and universities of the adoption of this recommendation is likely to be viewed favorably.

Incentives and Resources for Teachers The Carnegie Forum supports an incentive system for teachers based on school-wide student performance and the provision of resources essential to teacher productivity. Because it addresses internal school workings, this recommendation does not have a direct impact on state colleges and universities.

However, there may be substantial indirect impact on state colleges and universities as teachers, principals and other instructional leaders turn to state colleges and universities for pre- and in-service assistance in increasing student performance. Further, not all teachers are fully prepared to make the best use of the kinds of resources recommended. Pre- and in-service assistance in how to use increased resources to bolster teacher productivity may become a major role for state colleges and universities.

Teachers and other school personnel are likely to become considerably more interested in student and teacher assessment procedures. Thus they may pressure state colleges and universities to include more training in this area in both pre- and in-service work.

The possible implications for state colleges and universities of implementation of this recommendation are:

1. As resources to support teaching increase, there is likely to be a reduction in complaints that one's teacher preparation program did not prepare the individual for "the real world."
2. As teachers and administrators recognize needs to increase achievement and productivity, there is likely to be continued contact with state colleges and universities, through formal or informal in-service activities, to get the most recent information on how to accomplish positive results in this area.

Competitive Salaries and Career Opportunities The Carnegie Forum advocates salaries and career opportunities being competitive with other professions. There will be support of this recommendation among state colleges and universities, although there is not a direct effect on these institutions.

The possible implications for state colleges and universities of the implementation of this recommendation are:

1. As the tangible and intangible rewards for being in the teaching profession

increase, more people will want to become teachers, thus increasing enrollments in state colleges and universities.

2. As salaries and working conditions improve, more people will stay in teaching, making it a career. Thus the teacher shortage will be reduced, eliminating many state problems with emergency credentialing and inappropriate alternative credentialing which are also often problems for state colleges and universities.
3. As teaching becomes a life-long career for an increased number, more of these people will desire further training through state colleges and universities. This may have the effect of some reduction in programs in counseling, administration, and other specializations, as some school personnel find that they need not go into these lines of work for career advancement.

RESEARCH-ORIENTED UNIVERSITIES

IMPLICATIONS OF NCATE REDESIGN

To assess basic skills using standardized tests prior to admission and to assess the competence of graduates at exit, research-oriented universities with faculty knowledgeable in evaluation must identify existing, valid assessment devices and procedures or design and develop new assessment approaches. Beyond doing this in their own institutions, they have a professional obligation to help others not having similar resources. Similarly, since members of the new Board of Examiners must be skilled in evaluation techniques such as interpretation of quantified data, evaluation personnel, primarily situated in research-oriented institutions, will be needed. It appears that evaluation personnel will be in even greater demand than now and that in addition to teaching evaluation courses, they must begin to fulfill new and enlarged roles.

In addition to the special demands which will be made upon faculty of research-oriented institutions, they will be required to teach, do scholarly work, and become more closely involved with school practitioners doing collaborative research. Clearly, faculty loads must be considered in light of new and increased demands.

In order to base teacher education on research in professional practice, research-oriented universities must help identify worthy extant inquiry of effective schools, effective educational practices, and effective teaching. Where such knowledge is either unworthy or unavailable, the professional obligation to produce it rests primarily with such institutions. Faculty loads and rewards need to be shifted to support inquiry and graduate research associates need to be provided. Furthermore, some faculty need to be given the support necessary to be effective in knowledge production activities.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HOLMES GROUP

The implementation of an extended or add-on, two-year master's degree in education as the sole means of preparing certified teachers for the job market, has considerable implications for research-oriented universities. Within such education units the undergraduate degree would be eliminated. Faculty and staff involved in such degree programs would need to be reassigned. Undergraduate professional

courses for the most part would be renumbered, perhaps renamed, and moved to the graduate level in order to continue to meet individual state or NASDTEC program approval standards. Present graduate courses would continue to be taken by practicing teachers. Thus, dual track master's degree programs would be offered, at least for a while.

The establishment of three tiers of teachers—instructors, professionals and career professionals—would necessitate change. In order to prepare "instructors," provisions would need to be made to ensure that holders of baccalaureate degrees have a sound general education, a strong major or minor in their teaching field(s), and the basics of pedagogy. The latter could require either developing a pre-education undergraduate program or a post-graduate preparation experience. Whichever the choice, according to the report, some provision would need to be made to make instructors minimally ready for life in classrooms.

To prepare "professionals," a two-year master's degree would need to be established. The new post-graduate program would include additional study of the following, some of which might also serve to meet state program approval requirements: child development and child advocacy; diagnosis of children's learning needs and use of referral services; advanced study of motivation and human learning; advanced study of pedagogy; classroom management; reflective teaching (preparation of more thoughtful students of teaching); advanced study in the candidate's teaching field; and a year of supervised practice in part with children at risk. Incentives would be necessary or potential enrollees might attend traditional four-year programs at institutions that are not members of the Holmes Group.

Since in certain research-oriented institutions doctoral students are partially supported by teaching undergraduates while master's degree students are given fee waivers for supervising early field experiences and student teaching, adjustments would be necessary. Alternative sources of support would be required for both, or graduate enrollments would decline.

To prepare "career professionals," a special graduate program would need to be established with attention to teacher education, instructional management, learning, and advanced study of subject-matter pedagogy. In order to recruit potential career professionals, local education agencies would need to commit to their employment.

To improve undergraduate instruction for potential instructors and professionals, either considerable university-wide staff development activities would be required, or students would be limited to placements in classes with proven, exemplary teachers. In either case, provision would need to be made for potential teachers to interact with tertiary-level, subject-matter specialists regarding the teaching of that discipline in K-12 settings.

More in-depth study of the subjects elementary teachers will teach would necessitate having minors in the common-branch subjects, i.e., reading and the language arts, arithmetic, social studies, science, and so forth. Such study would probably be a baccalaureate requirement and might cause a rethinking of high school requirements for those proposing to enter teaching.

More in-depth study of pedagogy by secondary school teaching aspirants would need to be included in the graduate program for professionals.

The preparation of more thoughtful, reflective teachers would require staff development of both on-campus and field-based teacher educators who could encourage novices and practitioners to consider teaching analytically and problematically.

Utilization of K-12 teachers in teacher education could be accomplished in a number of ways. For example, in the Australian manner they could be seconded to take the place of, or interchange places with, on-campus teacher educators.

To change field experiences to become more clinical in nature, practicing teachers and teacher educators working with potential professionals would need education (understanding) and training (skill) in such alternatives as microteaching, simulations and on-campus, pre-field experience work to introduce students to these concepts.

To identify and focus on the knowledge base that supports teaching practice, the professional's curriculum must give attention to research in effective schooling, research in effective teaching, and research in effective K-12 educational practices. In parallel fashion, career professionals must understand what is known about these at more advanced levels.

The evaluation of teacher candidates at several points as called for in the report would require rethinking and extension of present procedures. Clearly, new tests would need to be established and other data collected.

Stepped-up research on teaching, teacher education, and the learning of academic subjects would probably require more faculty time given to such activities, and the provision of graduate research assistants.

To transform K-12 schools into places highly regarded for their professional autonomy where teacher leadership is apparent, research-oriented institutions will need to convince local education agencies to commit to working with Holmes Group institutions and especially to utilizing the concepts of staff differentiation and career professionals. Relatedly, Holmes Group institutions must influence state program approval standards in ways that support such concepts.

Establishing "professional development schools" analogous to teaching hospitals will require the study of teaching hospitals and the identification of selected schools that can be so transformed.

To increase the number and quality of minority candidates in teacher preparation will necessitate determining the attributes and interests of present exemplary minority teachers, using them as role models, identifying high school and university students with similar aptitudes and interest, and recruiting them vigorously.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CARNEGIE FORUM

Although the Carnegie report provides less specific detail regarding procedures than does the Holmes Group report, both call for: educating future teachers for career ladders; requiring a bachelor's degree in general education as a prerequisite for professional study; extending the pursuit of certification from the present four to six years; improving undergraduate instruction; increasing minority participation in teaching; admitting novices contingent upon testing; increasing study in content fields for elementary teachers and in pedagogy for secondary teachers; establishing clinical experiences in schools made analogous to teaching hospitals;

and identifying and using the knowledge that supports teaching practice. The implications of these similar recommendations are presented elsewhere in this Report.

One notable difference between Holmes and Carnegie is the latter's championing of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Successful development and implementation of a National Board to establish standards for high levels of competence in the teaching profession will rest on the identification and further development of knowledge directly related to successful practice. Research-oriented universities are in a critical position to assist in this task since within their respective states and nationally they have considerable responsibility for knowledge production and also possess faculty expertise in testing and evaluation. They also are likely to be enlightened regarding the need to broaden the scope of usual teacher testing efforts to include the notion of "work samples," i.e., providing teachers with simulated, job-related tasks such as planning, instructing, evaluating, reflecting and solving classroom dilemmas.

To make or improve contributions to continuing education, research-oriented universities may need to reconsider the foci of graduate course work and the nature of their involvement with local education agencies. In the former case, direction might need to be given to preparing teachers to become agents of school and teaching improvement instead of preparing extra-classroom specialists such as supervisors (or doctoral students of supervision more versed in theory and curriculum speculation than in life in schools and classrooms). It is clear that university faculty would have to examine their willingness and ability to work more collaboratively with school personnel.

To keep teachers well informed in their fields, advanced courses would need to be designed specifically for in-service teachers. The common practice of combining content or methods courses for both preservice and inservice education would probably need to be discontinued.

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

IMPLICATIONS OF NCATE REDESIGN

The new set of standards adopted by NCATE should have significant impact on a local education agency. The standards which explicitly address the world of practice, the faculty and an established knowledge base have particular relevance for a school system and may strengthen future collaboration efforts.

The NCATE standard requiring the faculty to model the best practice in its own instruction will, indeed, have implications. Should the standard be implemented to the fullest, the district should be able to assume that a teacher, hired with no experience and new to the profession, will possess a more extensive repertoire of pedagogical skills and alternatives from which to draw. Accordingly, continuing education councils will have to determine appropriate self-development for a better prepared individual. Teacher induction programs will have to extend and refine the skills of this new professional at a higher level on the developmental continuum.

A college or university adhering to rigorous instructional quality control will be able to assure to a school district that the competencies in teacher education are

written, job related, and implemented. Hence, more of a developmental rather than a deficit approach to inservice, especially for new personnel, will be designed and carried out at the local level.

Since a strong parent information and involvement component is considered an essential requisite for the success of a student today, a system can reasonably assure parents that their child is receiving instruction from a qualified and knowledgeable new teacher who has seen the best models of teaching, is practicing these models, and is given the opportunity to learn on the job.

The NCATE requirements to link higher education with school systems will necessitate new and expanding collaborative efforts. To determine the success of a graduate in professional roles requires university/college staff to be aligned with personnel offices in school districts. Data collection procedures and the use of computerized retrieval systems of personnel records would have to be ascertained, mutually, for optimum results and the protection of the employee.

To involve practitioners in determining college programs and objectives suggests released time to participate in the assignments, possible additional remuneration, and availability of information sources in order for the representative(s) to be effective and well informed.

The standard citing the development of cooperative research and inquiry would involve building an ethos for investigative inquiry, delineation of procedures for the system and college to conduct such research, and reallocation of priorities and staff responsibilities to jointly design and complete the experimentations.

The standard requiring faculty to be closely involved with the world of practice gives support to the claim that valid programs of clinical experiences rest upon the principle of joint responsibility and accountability. The linkage implies that the practicum phase of teacher education be shaped and controlled through joint college-school decision-making opportunities. Policies governing student teaching and field experiences will need to be negotiated between the two agencies and written in order to define this school/college connection.

Orientation of both public school and college personnel to the content and philosophy of the college and public school programs, the drafting of planned sequences of clinical experiences in the total school setting, and joint processes for student and program evaluation should be considered in this framework.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HOLMES GROUP

Since the goals and basic commitments of the Holmes Group lead from the universities to the schools in which teachers practice, a reaction/response from the public schools' sector seems most appropriate.

The commitment of the Holmes Group to phase-out the undergraduate education major in member institutions has far-reaching implications for local school systems. If all teacher training institutions did not adhere to this undergraduate organizational change, and, at this point, the recommendation applies only to member institutions, school systems would in all likelihood, hire those graduates from institutions which have retained the undergraduate professional sequence rather than hire a graduate who has had no professional training. The obvious rationale for the decision rests on economics and the need to assure school boards

and parents that a total novice "instructor" has not been hired. There would be those in public education who would even argue that placing such an "instructor" in the teaching force could be considered a form of malpractice which could become the seed for future legal battles.

Status differentiation will inevitably surface between teachers prepared the "new way" and those already employed. Will this enhance collegiality, an important item on the Holmes agenda, or fragment the profession even further?

Discontinuing undergraduate programs would undoubtedly contribute to a pronounced shortage of staff in the short term, especially for school systems in the proximity of research-oriented universities which have abolished their undergraduate programs. Such systems would have to restructure recruitment procedures and/or foster strong teacher-induction endeavors. Induction programs require a commitment by a system to build a series of interventions which will extend, refine and modify the skills of an entering professional. Effective induction programs entail released time for training and require the hiring or reallocation of personnel to coordinate the total effort. There are systems today with exemplary induction models, and extensive research is underway in a variety of settings. School districts in the induction planning stage will have to seek ways and means to capture the best of these sources.

A reassessment of the pedagogical curriculum is a meritorious goal and would certainly benefit those who will be employed in American schools. This would, undoubtedly, bring to the LEA a better trained individual. With a better trained teacher, however, the system would, in all probability, expect higher quality instruction and acceptance of more responsibility for the success of the school. A possible offshoot may see student achievement outcomes linked more directly to the teacher for evaluation and promotion.

If the reassessed curriculum is based on research and best practice, the curriculum, then, will be viewed with respect and credibility. If the content is based primarily on noneducators' opinions of what needs to be done and excludes school-based educators, many public educators will continue to view the college training ground as unrealistic.

To implement a comprehensive clinical experience for preservice teachers implies strong collaboration with school districts. This collaboration should not merely refer to services provided by school districts in support of college training programs, but to a true and equal partnership arrangement for the design and development of prospective teachers.

Acknowledgement that expertise is evident in both the school and college/university arenas for instructional exchange and staff development is crucial to the building of true collaboration. This involves not only an attitudinal change but also the institution of a set of policies.

The creation of a professional development school will require negotiations between a school system and a university. The question of governance will certainly become an issue. The report seems to imply that the control will be in the reins of higher education. If the school is physically the property of the system, is it reasonable to assume that the control of the curriculum and the staff will be the responsibility of the board of education? In order for the school to reflect the best

practices and climate, these issues will have to be resolved.

Professional development schools should be linked to the strongest and the best public systems, even if they do not exist in physical proximity to a research-oriented university. Hence, the most high-performing and achievement-oriented systems very well may not become clinical sites for preservice development.

Developing three tiers of professionals will require numerous alterations in a school system; i.e., job descriptions, responsibilities, evaluation procedures, staff development, and contractual agreements. The training of public educators to establish evidence as testimony to effective teaching and to become peer observers and supervisors will be inherent in any career ladder or incentive approach. The bigger questions of how and who funds the salary differential are paramount because those who are responsible for fiscal allocation inherently control programs.

Higher education influencing state and local policies regarding a differentiated structure of teacher preparation may be viewed by public school officials as higher education preempting school systems. This perceived erosion of traditional local responsibility and power could possibly produce a climate of distrust between the two agencies. If the LEA sees that funds are reduced because changes in higher education have drained off dollars, more, rather than less, competition for the funding dollars will ensue.

Hiring personnel who have demonstrated competence by exams measuring practice as well as content, would certainly have implications for interview practices, content of beginning teacher programs, and probationary evaluation procedures. The confidentiality and use of the scores attained by potential employees will have to be respected and policies established accordingly.

To increase the number of minorities in teacher education programs suggests to school systems a reexamination of the minority student status in the K-12 years. A concentrated effort to prepare minorities to be more competitive and to be enrolled in rigorous academic content courses would have to be undertaken. This will necessitate early identification of the student, a training component for guidance counselors, a strong parent network, and a sustained set of higher student expectations by teachers. However, to accomplish the ultimate goal of more minority teachers in the work force, the "selling" of the profession by public school educators to minority students—by word and deed—will have to be encouraged and practiced.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CARNEGIE FORUM

The Carnegie Forum call for a National Board has numerous consequences for a local educational agency. The member composition of the Board would be of significance to a school district to assure that decisions would not be skewed or vested for any one client group. Because of the nature and power of influence—political, organizational and professional—there is a chance that the local system's voice may not be heard adequately in the proposed regional and state structures.

Certainly, decisions at a local level would be affected, particularly those involving hiring practices and staff assignments. There would be those teachers who applied for Board recognition and failed to receive the imprimatur. External pressures may compel the district to relegate these people to a secondary role, possibly

precluding future promotion. Conversely, there would be those teachers who meet every standard. Districts would have to establish guidelines and procedures to utilize such personnel to the fullest and to determine means to recognize this group with appropriate rewards.

National Board certification may have the potential of forming a dichotomy between teachers who have one set of Board credentials and those who have credentials from a different board or state agency. The possibility of an elitist group emerging may compound the situation and require new public information efforts, creation of a climate for selective merit pay, and acceptance of teacher promotion based on documented performance and National Board credentials.

Though reform groups are calling for increased initial preparation time and higher standards, supply and demand factors may short-circuit this professional enhancement and necessitate that a district create alternative training routes for achieving certification requirements. Thus, reconciling the differences between a local board's immediate priorities and the optimum standards set by a National Board becomes a concern. Professionally acceptable options for solving the conflict will have to be determined. The potential for increased control is enormous when a single, national group—while voluntary in design—establishes standards for the teaching profession which local boards would have to consider in addition to state criteria.

To create an optimum professional environment for teaching will necessitate a major change in schools. A teacher, in most systems, has a course load of 30 student contact hours per week with limited released time; consequently, time for collegial sharing and goal development is difficult to extract from a typical school day. To convert this traditional structure calls not only for additional personnel and funds but also for new visionary approaches to scheduling. A major public information thrust will be needed to convince the public that teacher course loads should be curtailed to mirror the higher education format.

Establishing goals from a data base and holding staff responsible for such goals entails a goal-setting process, staff development, and formative monitoring procedures.

Systems would need to study and devise the most equitable statistical procedures to compute the expectancy level of students when student progress becomes a factor in determining success or failure of instruction.

The recommendation to restructure the teaching force and to place the principal in an external director's capacity is a major departure from most existing school organizational structures. New policies would have to be formulated to reflect differentiated management roles in the school. The teacher, in a lead instructional position, would need a generic knowledge base for: all aspects of instruction; methodology regarding productivity with people; and skills in decision making, supervision and budgeting.

The principal, in this model, would need to recognize and understand the concept of a collegium administering the school rather than an individual. Training in the art of disseminating information and feedback for the purpose of shared decision making will become a critical component.

The implication for the retraining of those principals who have developed pat-

terms of managing schools based on control and authoritarian roles becomes doubly important. Since these principals generally have been in their positions for long periods of time and have created management styles which best fit their personalities, converting into a team management concept will inevitably result in serious role conflict, possibly rendering at least some of them ineffective in managing a school.

Particularly noted in the Carnegie report is the vision of a school in the future. The report sketches a school staffed by many levels of teachers and aides and one with appropriate and current technological resources, time for more student individualization and coaching, training of teacher interns and collegial relationships. For an LEA, this new configuration implies systematic and relevant staff development to use the technological support, to plan for the individualization, and to select and align the student materials.

The over-arching commitment of additional self-taxation and allocation of substantive resources that the public presently has been unwilling to undertake, will be essential for most of the reforms to become reality. Until this happens the rewards and accomplishments of the profession will not parallel those of other professions. Boards of education, administrators and teachers will need to forge new alliances to educate the public to the crisis in the profession rather than the crisis in the classroom that results from the public's neglect of the profession.

Commentary

Reaching consensus about the specific direction which second-wave teacher education and teaching reform efforts should take is anything but simple. It is demanding and frustrating because there are so many stakeholders internal and external to teacher education who need to be considered. Even consensus design will not be successful unless those who implement the design buy into it for one reason or another. The complexity of the situation cannot be overemphasized. Professional educator preparation is both organizationally and conceptually complex. There are different agenda to coordinate and vested interests to overcome in an arena which is very public and sensitive. The direction chosen can have dramatic effects on institutions, organizations and agencies, and indeed on the very lives of people and on the essence and culture of our society.

What are the consequences and implications of supporting the different proposals? Wholesale adoption of the Holmes and Carnegie model for teacher preparation would eliminate undergraduate teacher education majors. In a June 18, 1986 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (p. 23), Robert L. Saunders, former president of AACTE, estimated that no more than 60 percent of some 1250 colleges and universities with undergraduate programs today would still have them a decade from now.

But is there not something of value in the liberal arts model and its manner of preparing and educating students for productive roles in society? What about the value of tradition, of small classes, of close and personal relationships between students and professors (generally with doctorates), of broad as opposed to concentrated subject-matter training, and of the other elements which constitute a liberal arts college's definition of quality? Are these likely to be available if we move all professional teacher preparation to research universities?

Some educators do not want to eliminate four-year programs on the grounds that teacher salaries and working conditions are not attractive enough to justify the cost of an extra year or two. They argue that we cannot afford to dismantle successful programs and mount new experimental ones. In a period when minority recruitment is so vital, it simply makes little sense to expand the formal preparation period necessary before one can begin earning a salary.

Surely we can phase-in extended preparation programs with increased emphasis on subject matter at the undergraduate level. ATE has long supported extended programs for teacher preparation and has recognized limitations in four-year baccalaureate programs. Four-year programs can be considered both necessary first steps and pre-professional programs like law and medicine which require additional formal preparation prior to full certification. Such programs can prepare neophytes for entry-level positions.

Holmes and Carnegie would require elementary teachers to have academic majors. This would require substantive changes in most higher education teacher education programs and in the certification requirements in most states. But IHEs and SEAs are slow to change. Evolutionary strategies to achieve common goals established with states appear to be the more reasonable and effective ways to implement reform than are national, relatively revolutionary means.

Holmes and Carnegie would introduce a much stronger element of competition between teachers and IHEs which prepare them. Institutions of higher education and public schools are encouraged to use marketing techniques, and teachers are expected to compete for rewards, salary increases and promotions. The Holmes Group standards may compete and be compared with NCATE Standards, and Carnegie's National Board exam may compete and be compared with the NTE and state certification exams. Of course, some competition is healthy, but when does it become dysfunctional?

The Holmes and Carnegie reform agenda would reduce competition by forcing the elimination of some undergraduate teacher education programs. The strategy by research universities may backfire and result in students choosing to go to state colleges and universities where lower cost teacher preparation programs of both undergraduate and graduate varieties will be available.

Having to take a National Board exam may not be a significant issue for IHEs, but it is likely to be controversial with SEAs and LEAs.

A number of other questions arise when we consider implementing a relatively revolutionary rather than an evolutionary reform agenda.

1. Will undergraduate courses designed to meet state objectives and required competencies simply become graduate courses?
2. Will state expectations of teacher candidates change significantly?
3. Should IHEs change teacher preparation programs to be in line with the prescriptive professional curriculum components of NCATE, the five components of a comprehensive plan for teacher preparation put forth by the Holmes Group, and/or the Master in Teaching curriculum proposed by Carnegie?
4. Can a National Board exam be developed so that academic freedom and program creativity are not jeopardized?
5. How can diversity in American teacher education be promoted within a Carnegie and/or Holmes agenda?
6. Will IHEs change their reward structures, priorities, associations with pubic schools, and general operating policies to accommodate the Holmes and Carnegie agenda?
7. Will proved programs be cast aside and new experimental ones supported?

A revolutionary and national strategy is clearly needed in the view of some leading representatives of the teaching profession. This is why the Carnegie Corporation, for example, is investing heavily in reform. And indeed, the Carnegie Forum report may advance the professionalization of teaching. Perhaps the costs associated with the Carnegie recommendations are not unrealistic and the recommendations are not impractical. But:

1. In some states people have already had enough educational reform for a while. How can the report agenda be sustained? Many influential people will have to invest in the effort. We do know that the Carnegie Forum is

expected to continue to function for at least a decade and to seek action on its recommendations.

2. Teacher/practitioner support is needed for implementation. However, the recommendations for paying some teachers more than others, for relating teacher pay to student performance, and for promoting marketing approaches are inconsistent with traditional teacher positions. These differences may be overcome, however, if major teacher organizations develop and/or continue their support.
3. Those directly involved with implementing reforms also should be involved in designing the plans. Such processing takes much care and time. However, given the alleged urgency of the situation and the stature of Task Force signatories, perhaps the Carnegie Forum can, in the name of efficiency, "get away with" less than full involvement of several key groups.
4. Consistency among goals, recommendations and strategies is usually critical. However, the apparent inconsistencies between education goals and the report recommendations may not be valid or important. If the educational leadership, as well as various political leaders, can agree on the Carnegie Task Force recommendations and can push in a common direction, then constituencies may fall in line and make the reform agenda not only possible but also probable. If the mechanics of making a new certification work and the politics of control of schools and certification can be worked out behind the scenes, the reform agenda may prosper.
5. Principals, superintendents and school board members will be reluctant to hand over students, dollars and management to teachers. However, allowing teachers more responsibility and sharing authority and decision making can and has worked in schools and in other work settings.
6. Some states indicate an unwillingness to give up their responsibility to certify personnel. The New York State Commissioner of Education has made it clear that New York will never surrender its responsibility to certify teachers to a National Board. But he and others recognize that national standards can influence what is done in states. And since the National Board exam is voluntary, it does not need to be a threat to states since teacher certification is not really taken out of the hands of state officials who will continue to decide, with local authorities, most school issues.
7. The record of effective educational reform handed down from the national level gives little reason for optimism. If, however, the national effort is well coordinated with state efforts, then the overall impact can be effective. If articulated well, the nationalization of teacher certification will not result in state inaction or overreaction. Instead it may help states face the serious societal challenge of supplying our nation's schools with fully-qualified teachers happy to make teaching a life-long career.

It is generally recognized that appropriate reform of the education profession must look beyond the Carnegie recommendations, and beyond the Holmes Group and NCATE Redesign. Many excellent reforms already have been developed

through the encouragement of or by the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU), AACTE, ATE, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Council of States for Inservice Education (NCSIE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), NEA, AFT and numerous other organizations, commissions and groups.

In looking beyond the three reform proposals reviewed and analyzed in this Report, this ATE Task Force is sensitive to the fact that it is much easier to analyze and criticize than it is to evaluate objectively and to synthesize and develop an alternative vision of reform. Although such a synthesis and its development go beyond the original purpose of this Report, we feel obligated to at least outline aspects of teacher education reform with which we agree.

We believe that there are positive aspects of the three reform efforts presented and that the future of the teaching profession is brighter in the years immediately ahead then it has been for many years. The national attention being paid to improving the quality of teachers and schooling is encouraging. Also encouraging are more specific efforts to: recruit minority teachers; require basic skills and a liberal arts background for teachers; ensure subject-matter competence; develop clinical experiences and demonstration schools; promote internships and residencies; support teacher induction; encourage multiple evaluations; implement a systematic knowledge base; develop a congruent professional curriculum; provide additional resources for teacher preparation; and to update school technology.

This Report has indicated reservations about other specific features of the three reform proposals. We believe, for example, that the wholesale elimination of undergraduate education majors and/or programs is ill-advised. We also have doubts about the necessity of a National Board to certify teachers. Further, directly relating student performance to teacher incentives is a practice which we cannot enthusiastically endorse.

We support:

1. The encouragement of rigorous and different teacher preparation models that reflect the geographic, institutional and cultural diversity of our nation. Uniformity would destroy the diversity which has become the hallmark and strength of the American educational system.
2. Strategies designed to encourage underrepresented groups to become teachers.
3. Additional funds being directed to teacher preparation during this period of national crisis.
4. Expanded emphasis on developing the knowledge base for professional education.
5. A strong liberal arts background for teachers.
6. Strong, coherent curricular programs for teachers.
7. Evaluating teacher preparation programs and graduates.
8. The completion of an approved program of teacher preparation prior to certification.
9. Individual teacher candidate-centered assessment prior to state certification.

10. Assessing the basic skills of school personnel.
11. Using a variety of assessment methodologies over a long period of time in assessing teacher competence.
12. Developing a comprehensive assessment system including but not limited to paper-and-pencil tests to judge pedagogical expertise, professional skills, teacher performance or effectiveness, program worth, or eligibility for advancement or promotion.
13. Retaining state program review and/or NCATE review and expecting IHEs to be regionally accredited.
14. Encouraging both process and product assessment. In the education profession today, product assessment is being emphasized to the neglect of process assessment which is equally important.
15. Teacher education programs derived from and directed toward the goals and objectives of schooling within the states.
16. Moving from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced exams for teachers.
17. The elimination of emergency licenses and teaching out of one's field.
18. Establishing closer working relationships with select schools, including the encouragement of professional development schools or centers.
19. Internships and residency programs.
20. Preparation programs that allow for a variety of models and organizational delivery systems to prepare fully-certified individuals.
21. Increasing educator salaries and improving working conditions.
22. Career ladders and differentiated staffing in schools.
23. Giving teachers more authority and decision-making responsibilities.

These items do not address some specific and fundamental concerns centered around the question of what the essence of a professional teacher preparation curriculum should include. This ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force intends only to provide a framework within which to address curricular issues. Another ATE Commission on the Future Education of Teachers is currently addressing curriculum more directly.

We believe that the three visions of reform analyzed herein will have some positive consequences and note with interest these final observations.

1. More specific attention and incentives are needed in teacher education reform efforts to recruit underrepresented groups into teaching.
2. Teacher education reform efforts are placing too much faith in standardized testing which in the past has often proven to be discriminatory, irrelevant and/or invalid. Test-taking does not necessarily elevate the status or reputation of an occupation or profession. Reform efforts need to rely less upon standardized tests and more upon practical field evaluations conducted during teacher preparation and the first two years of full-time teaching.
3. NCATE and its Redesign effort should be supported for voluntary accreditation purposes and may be threatened and vulnerable if all the Carnegie and/or Holmes recommendations are implemented. The role of

national voluntary accreditation should not be denied an appropriate place in assuring a connection between teacher preparation programs and certification.

4. The AACTE board of directors this summer established a working group to study national certification. The ten members will work on identifying the steps essential in developing professional evaluation standards and the variety of interventions that must be employed to implement a certification system of national significance.

A Look to the Future

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

There is little doubt that education and teacher education in America will change dramatically in the decade ahead. Prestigious and credible groups, some quite apart from the profession,* are actively defining the reform agenda and are shaping the directions in which it will go.

It is time that the profession itself takes a proactive posture and begins to provide more of the intellectual and professional leadership and direction to the reform movement. Who is better equipped to provide vision, direction and leadership than those who have been intimately involved in the development and delivery of education and teacher education over the years?

A primary motivation of professional educators ought to be to design, develop, implement and evaluate the best education and teacher education programs possible—programs that have theoretical, intellectual and practical integrity. Our overall goal should be to make teaching a respected and productive profession, both in the manner in which it functions as well as in the way it is perceived by the public.

Important and difficult questions facing professional educators today in the wake of a plethora of reports and reform agenda are questions relating to posture, leadership and procedures. What should be the position of the teaching profession? What kind of leadership should it be providing? What goals and priorities should the profession be espousing? And how should professionals be proceeding in the quest for excellence and productivity?

Our search for excellence and productivity must not only be consistent with the values and priorities of society, but must also be guided by what has been learned from past research and experience to be effective. With each new report and each emerging set of recommendations, the options and possibilities become more and more confounding. In an attempt to provide some assistance in dealing with these issues and questions, the following is presented.

ANOTHER VISION

Significant and lasting improvements in education and professional development will not be possible without cooperative willingness and cooperative professional agreements on the part of teachers and administrators (both in the public schools and in higher education), state department personnel, and organizational leaders. As long as critical differences exist among segments of our profession, and as long as ideas and proposals remain the partisan view of one constituent group (e.g., teachers, administrators, school boards, or university professors), no matter how salient the ideas or proposals are in their own right or how convincingly they are presented, or how well they are supported financially—if they do not enjoy broad-based endorsement within the profession, they will not have significant or lasting impact. This has been demonstrated over and over.

*Profession is being used herein to include teachers, administrators, professors, organizational leaders, state education agency personnel and support personnel.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL NETWORK OF STATES FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION

There is a critical need for a broad-based *"National Network of States* for the Teaching Profession" (NNSTP) comprised of representatives, drawn on an *equitable* basis, from *all* of the major constituent groups of the teaching profession. This "Network," among other things, would be charged with the responsibility for determining generic process/product goals and priorities for the teaching profession, for setting standards for professional practice and productivity, and for providing developmental direction and support for the profession. If a national organization currently exists that could assume these functions (such as NCATE, NASDTEC or NCSIE/these have broad-based representations from a number of organizations), we would find it preferable that such an organization be empowered and supported rather than creating an entirely new bureaucratic entity.

A major function of a "National Network of States for the Teaching Profession" would be *personnel recruitment, development and utilization*, including:

1. making an annual national projection (5-8 years into the future) of the personnel needs according to grade level, cultural diversity, teaching major, and administrative and support positions, and distributing these data to states, regions, schools and teacher preparation institutions;
2. working with states and the preparing institutions and advising them of the pending or projected shortages or oversupply;
3. developing, in cooperation with other educational groups (e.g., NEA, AFT, AASA, CCSSO, ATE and AACTE), national recruitment programs to recruit the best and the brightest into the profession beginning with high school students in future teacher associations and in accordance with the projected needs. Special attention must be paid to minority recruitment.
4. working with the states, with the preparing institutions, and with the professional organizations to establish recruitment procedures and admission criteria;
5. maintaining a profile on the various traditional and non-traditional training programs and assisting prospective candidates seeking admission to preparation programs in line with their career goals;
6. providing similar services for administrative and support personnel; and
7. providing a national placement service.

Another important function of the NNSTP would be to develop national standards (guidelines) for certification and practice. These standards would be developed and implemented cooperatively between the NNSTP and the states where the legal authority and responsibility for certifying school personnel rest. Once developed and adopted, states would be expected to use these guidelines as a basis for their own standards and practice. The development and use of these standards (national guidelines) would be the responsibility of the "profession," not agencies of the federal or state government. The NNSTP would also develop models for delivering standards to meet the needs of students in the various states.

Among other things, the NNSTP would promote two very important positive

outcomes: (1) It would provide a vehicle for an ongoing working alliance between those who share the professional responsibilities for education and teacher education (the teaching profession) and those who have the legal responsibilities (the states); and (2) It would begin to deal with the problems created by standards being set independently by 50 different states and almost 1300 teacher preparation institutions and over 16,000 employing school boards.

THE PREPARATION AND TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

Institutions of higher education and other organizations meeting the same state standards should have options in terms of how they prepare people for the profession. Several options for the structure of the professional curriculum exist. A program: (1) may be entirely undergraduate; (2) may begin at the undergraduate level and bridge to the post-baccalaureate level; (3) may be entirely at the graduate/post-baccalaureate level; or (4) it may be a program delivered through a variety of institutional, organizational and agency configurations. Although all four of these formats should continue to exist, the two most prevalent modes of preparation in the long run will probably be the undergraduate-graduate mode and the graduate mode.

Candidates will come into preparation programs with a strong liberal arts background. Secondary candidates will have an academic major. Early childhood, elementary, middle-school and special education candidates may have an academic major, or they may have multiple supporting academic concentrations in line with the teaching responsibility they will have upon employment.

The undergraduate/graduate mode would have the following characteristics:

1. Candidates would begin their professional preparation while still undergraduates.
2. They would enter programs of preparation with strong liberal arts and subject-matter backgrounds.
3. They would be required to pass a competency exam in liberal studies (a general knowledge test).
4. Their undergraduate professional curriculum would be similar to the typical program of professional studies that exists today, except that there would be more emphasis on the liberal arts, some undergraduate pre-student teaching field experiences but less emphasis on student teaching (since there will be an internship later). This might be viewed as "pre-education" analogous to pre-law and pre-med. [There is, however, at least one problem with this approach. Acceptance of more liberal arts background as a prerequisite for entry into teacher education could possibly destroy a major benchmark established by the reformers of the 1970s, i.e., extensive school field experiences throughout a student's program prior to student teaching (Nussel). Within the teaching profession there is general acceptance of the value of field and/or clinical experiences for learning professional roles *prior to* student teaching or internships].
5. Upon completion of their undergraduate program, students would be expected to pass a core battery of tests (similar to the NTE), as well as a profi-

ciency exam in their teaching area(s).

6. Upon the successful completion of their undergraduate programs, candidates would enter the *induction* phase. The induction phase would:
   a. bridge the preservice and inservice phases of the professional curriculum;
   b. be collaboratively developed and administered by the colleges/universities and the schools;
   c. provide a post-baccalaureate, protracted period of study and practice with an imbedded internship;* This post-baccalaureate protracted period of study and practice (1-2 years) would be prior to accepting full-time employment, and prior to being initially (even provisionally) certified;
   d. provide an opportunity and a vehicle to develop and monitor a sequential approach to the assumption of professional responsibility based upon demonstrated readiness and competence;
   e. provide a program of clinical practice and professional development; This program would include micro-teaching, simulations and coaching as well as multiple options for supervised practice. Provision for these would draw upon the resources and expertise of both the training arm at the university and the practicing arm in the schools (as well as others);
   f. provide for a continuous monitoring and tracking system that would supply regular feedback, developmental data, and clinical assistance on a personal basis for each individual candidate.
7. Teachers would have to demonstrate ongoing currency in their fields if they are to maintain or advance their placement on a career ladder. Upon the successful completion of the induction phase, the candidate would be eligible to receive a master's degree and to be employed as a beginning practitioner, perhaps with the title of "instructor." Each instructor would be assigned support personnel, have temporary certification, have a reduced load, and would continue to formally pursue professional studies.

   Each instructor would be evaluated by a site-based team composed of his or her mentor, the building principal, and another teacher educator, preferably a college-based teacher educator. This committee would provide both formative and summative data and would ultimately make a recommendation as to whether or not the "instructor" moves to the position of "teacher." A "teacher" must fully meet certification requirements.
8. Having attained the status of "teacher," he or she would be expected to continue his or her professional development. This would include academic studies, pedagogical studies, research and clinical practice. With added experience, proven leadership, and continuing evidence of professional growth and development, the "teacher" would advance up the career ladder.

*The induction internship differs from the beginning teacher internship in that the individual is a supervised intern, is not a school employee and is not legally responsible for the instruction of students.

The graduate model would be similar to the undergraduate/graduate model except that the total professional curriculum would be at the post-baccalaureate, graduate level. The candidates would come with baccalaureate degrees and completed majors. They would spend two years in a "professional school" program.

CERTIFICATION/LICENSURE

1. There would be three levels of teacher certification: a) instructor (temporary), b) teacher, and c) career teacher. The title "teacher" would be reserved for a fully-certified practitioner.
2. Teachers would be certified for the early, middle and secondary levels.
3. Administrators and support personnel would be drawn from the ranks of career teachers who have had appropriate advanced training and have successfully completed a supervised internship in the specific area to which they are moving. Separate certifications would be awarded for specific administrative and/or support roles.
4. Certificates would be issued by the states and would have to be reissued every five years based upon demonstrated satisfactory performance.

THE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS

1. Schools would be organized and managed very differently than they are today.
2. Schools would move away from hierarchical and authoritative management models toward shared-management and collegial models where decisions regarding curriculum, program development and methods of delivery are more in the hands of informed teachers, and the day-to-day leadership for these decisions is in the hands of a "lead" teacher.
3. Instruction would be highly individualized. Serious consideration would be given to at-risk populations and to the cultural, ethnic and sociological diversity of the students when planning programs and selecting staff.
4. Technology, including computers and computer-assisted instruction, would be greatly expanded. Students would spend an increasing amount of time on an individual basis with interactive terminals. Individual tracking and profiling of students' growth and achievement would be available to the faculty via technology. Computer adaptive testing will radically change evaluation systems—making most testing formative as opposed to summative and allowing for whatever cultural diversity exists in the classroom or the school.
5. Teaching would be considered a highly intellectual activity, a complex art and science, and a prestigious professional endeavor and career.

CONSORTIAL APPROACHES FOR PROVIDING TEACHER PREPARATION

1. In line with the need for a spirit of cooperation among different segments of the teaching profession, we suggest that every teacher training institution develop professional development centers with public schools. These centers, not unlike teaching hospitals, are intended to be places where the

training arm and the practicing arm of the profession can work together to provide instruction for elementary, middle and secondary school students. Practitioners would help teach university programs in centers as part of the faculty. Also, the centers would focus upon the selection, training and induction of new people into the profession. These centers would be a focal point for research and development of more effective and efficient education and teacher education programs. They should be jointly developed and administered by LEA and IHE personnel. These centers would involve local boards of education, the business and corporate communities, parents, students, school lay personnel and the public in formulating policies, practices and support for school efforts. Strong and positive relationships between colleagues, with the public, with business and industry, and with the media would be emphasized.

2. *Multi-institutional schools of education* should be explored and developed. With such models, the cooperating institutions could mutually agree to divide the responsibility for teacher education in any way they wish. Each individual site could do that which they can do best, and the students could either commute to the various sites for that portion of their training, or the professors and programs could be packaged and transported to a location convenient to the students. Distance education delivery techniques might be quite practical with such an arrangement.

   With these kinds of models teacher candidates have access to the total resources of all the cooperating institutions. This approach could greatly enhance the quality of the preparation, particularly for those programs that exist in very small institutions having few faculty members.

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY FACULTY INCENTIVES AND REWARDS

In order to achieve more effective and efficient programs of teacher preparation, new patterns of differentiated faculty utilization must be developed. Furthermore, the reward structure in higher education institutions must change. An equally prestigious two-track system needs to be developed for faculty (a research track and a professional track). SCDEs must negotiate with their institutions to be able to tenure and promote faculty according to standards and criteria appropriate for professors in professional schools, much the same as medicine, architecture and fine arts have done. Without this, SCDEs cannot risk being responsible to their profession and will die from a failure to do so. Without this, faculty cannot risk spending their time and energies in advising, training, supervising or working with schools and school-based personnel.

If educators believe that their work is scholarly and professional, they should not have any trouble defending it to college and/or university colleagues as being worthy of the same unique consideration given law, medicine, architecture and fine arts.

Conclusion

Changes in the profession and changes in the educational system in America are inevitably tied to one another. Improvements of significant and lasting educational value begin and end with the people who provide the direction, leadership and instruction. As C. Peter Magrath, President of the University of Missouri, pointed out in Flagstaff during his keynote address to the ATE Summer Workshop participants, "Those who can teach effectively are among our nation's most important doers." To the extent that they are informed, involved, responsible and committed, change will have significant and lasting effects. Legislated, nationally directed, mandated or forced change will very likely backfire. The stakes are too high for cosmetic, artificial, superficial, simplistic or politically-motivated proposals. Substantial reform of teacher education is not likely to come from national commissions or specially created new organizations. Where change occurs the initiative will most likely come from local accountable organizations.

We advocate phased-in, evolutionary approaches which have the carefully-constructed and deliberate support of those who daily share professional roles and responsibilities for developing and implementing quality education programs. Achieving excellence in education and teacher education for our current and future students depends upon the cooperative amalgamation and mobilization of many forces. This is the greatest challenge in our country today.

References

AACTE Briefs VII (May-June, 1986).

"AILACTE States Need for Alternatives," *AACTE Briefs* VII (August, 1986), 15.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, May, 1986.

Cornbleth, Catherine. "Ritual and Rationality in Teacher Education Reform," *Educational Researcher* XV (April, 1986), 5-14.

Emans, Robert and Hadley, Marilyn. "Hello Prominent, Research-Oriented Universities; NCATE and the Teaching Profession Need You!" *Action in Teacher Education* VIII (Fall, 1986), 9-17.

Garcia, Peter A. *A Study on Teacher Competency Testing and Test Validity with Implications for Minorities and The Results and Implications of the Use of the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) as a Screening Device for Entrance into Teacher Education Programs in Texas.* Edinburg, Texas: Pan American University, March, 1986.

Gibney, Thomas and Wiersma, William. "Using Profile Analysis for Student Teacher Evaluation," *Journal of Teacher Education* XXXVII (May-June, 1986), 41-45.

Haberman, Martin. "Licensing Teachers: Lessons from Other Professions," *Phi Delta Kappan* LXVII (June, 1986), 719-722.

King, John E. "Holmes, Sweet Holmes." Draft paper presented to the AASCU Task Force on Excellence in Education. Bal Harbour, Florida, November 24, 1985. Final Draft, June 1, 1986.

Magrath, C. Peter, Chair, National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. *A Call for Change in Teacher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985.

NCATE Redesign. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, April, 1985.

NEA Leadership Briefing Paper, on the Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. May, 1986.

Nussel, Edward J. "What the Holmes Group Report Doesn't Say," *Phi Delta Kappan* LXVIII (September, 1986), 36–38.

Roth, Robert A. "NCATE Standards and the Holmes Group: A Comparative Analysis." Unpublished paper. University of South Florida. April, 1986.

Sikula, John P. "One Response to the Report of The California Commission on the Teaching Profession," The Featured Article, *Teacher Education Quarterly* XIII (Winter, 1986), 1-9.

"Teacher Unions Give Qualified Backing to Carnegie Proposals on School Reform," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* XXXII (July 16, 1986), 1, 22.

Tomorrow's Teachers, A Report of The Holmes Group. East Lansing: The Holmes Group, Inc., 1986.

Who Will Teach Our Children? A Strategy For Improving California's Schools, The Report of The California Commission on the Teaching Profession. Sacramento: California Commission on the Teaching Profession, November, 1985.

ORDERING INFORMATION

Copies of

Visions of Reform: Implications for the Education Profession
The Report of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force

may be ordered from:

The Association of Teacher Educators
Suite ATE
1900 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

Phone: (703) 620-3110

Single copy (prepaid): $8.00

Non Profit Org.
BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Ann Arbor, Mich.
Permit No. 433

ASSOCIATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS
Suite ATE, 1900 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091
Phone: (703) 620-3110

ROBERT J. STEVENSON, *Executive Director*